

The Obsolescence

Of Words

A Study, Based Chiefly on the

New English Dictionary

Of Changes in Our Vocabulary Since Ca. 1650

by

Edwin Berck Dike, M. A.

Submitted for the Degree of Ph. D. at the

University of Edinburgh

1932

1933



Acknowledgements

For various initial suggestions from Dr. George Philip Krapp at Columbia University, 1923—1929, the writer is grateful. The obsoletisms were collected from the writer's set of the New English Dictionary in California, 1929—1931, and during the same months many books—first editions (1611—ca. 1800) and learned and bibliographical works of all kinds—were consulted and read at the Huntington Library. Courtesies extended there will always be remembered.

The death of Dr. S. J. Crawford deprived the writer of a counsellor at Edinburgh. Dr. George Kitchin kindly read the dissertation as it appeared, chapter by chapter, and gave appreciated criticism. The interest and help, chiefly through correspondence, of numerous friends and former teachers—Dr. Majl Ewing, Dr. Dorothy Kaucher, Mr. Wendell Fogg, Dr. W. F. Bryan, Dr. Robert Ramsay (especially,) Dr. E. L. Getchell, and Dr. J. L. Lowes—was encouraging.

Except in a few lists, obsoletisms are underscored (thus,) living forms are within single quotation marks ('thus,') and titles, quoted matter, definitions, meanings, explanations, and the like, are within double quotation marks ("thus.") The writer's original intention of putting supplementary material in Appendix E was discarded, in sections II and III, and footnotes were resorted to. In this way, the material has been perhaps more conveniently and appropriately assembled. The reader will be able to see at a glance just where the obsoletisms are sometimes most profuse.

Notwithstanding, as his own critic, the writer deplores the

Acknowledgements

length of some of the footnotes, and sees imperfection elsewhere in his work. If publication is possible, condensation and further refinement will be made; but the study in its full form is offered here as a dissertation.

Contents

| | <u>I</u> | <u>Page</u> |
|--|----------|-------------|
| CH. I. <u>Introductory</u> . Aim and scope. Opinions of scholars and writers on the subject. The use of the <u>New English Dictionary</u> in this study | | 2 |
| CH. II. <u>Historical</u> (I.) Casual comments on words, especially their obsolescence. Wilkins. Locke. The lexicographers, Cotgrave to Johnson. Dr. Johnson's views | | 25 |
| CH. III. <u>Historical</u> (II.) Speech in literature before the mid-seventeenth century. The vocabulary in literature ca. 1650 ff.: attitudes, inventions, usage . . . | | 50 |
| <u>II</u> | | |
| CH. IV. <u>Sounds</u> . Euphony. Significance of sound. Foreignism. Onomatopoeia. Homophones. Historical examples . . . | | 119 |
| CH. V. <u>Forms</u> . Oversupply in the seventeenth century and after. Form-association. Analogy. Assimilation. Rival forms. Uses—verbs as substantives, &c. Shortened forms. Corruptions, &c. Isolation—single words and families of words. Foreignism. Conclusion . . . | | 160 |
| CH. VI. <u>Affixes</u> . Obsolete affixes. Isolation in affixes. Suffixes of diminution. Feminine distinctions. Rivalries: <u>-able</u> , <u>-acy</u> , <u>-al</u> , <u>-ant</u> , &c.; negatives; personal endings; adjectival suffixes (<u>-ic</u> , <u>-ical</u> ;) substantive suffixes (especially <u>-ery</u> , <u>-age</u> , <u>-ment</u> .) Vogue . . . | | 259 |

Contents

III

CH. VII. Form and Meaning. Association. Deceptive words and forms. Failure of accord between form and meaning 349

CH. VIII. Obsolete Things. Their significance and variety. Coins. Dress. Food and drink. Customs and sports. Trades and occupations. Technicalities. Transportation. Arms. Summary. 360

CH. IX. Obsolete Names and Ideas. Science. -- Geology. Chemistry. Astronomy. Physics. Mathematics. Grammar and grammar schools. Arts. -- Music. Philosophy and religion. History. . . 391

CH. X. Usage. Some opinions. Use and abuse as causes of obsolescence. Changes in meaning. Idioms 419

IV

CH. XI. Conclusion. Recapitulation. Percentages of obsolescences in OE, ME, MNE. Dates. Our oldest obsolete words. Summary of causes. The individual obsolescence. Size of man's vocabulary. Conclusion. 439

APPENDICES 459

BIBLIOGRAPHY 571

CH. I

One aim, though intricate in all of its ramifications, underlies this study: it is to discover how and why words become obsolete. That the aim, thus stated, is incapable of complete realization, is perhaps obvious; and accordingly only two eras of English life and literature were particularly looked at, and only certain approaches were made. The choice of the Restoration and Queen Anne Periods was not precisely arbitrary, but was somewhat dictated by the materials in the New English Dictionary; and an effort has been made throughout to treat of these times not as isolated microcosms, but with historical sympathy and propriety.

Words have always been alluring objects, and data and evidence for a closer and truer study of them are now especially abundant. Scholarship has been liberal in casting new light on old things, and words are among them, but not, it would seem, words collectively from this viewpoint. Writers and scholars have taken note. It was heartening, quite some time ago now, to read certain brief but carefully pointed comments by a contributor to the Cambridge History of English Literature, and then to recall remarks of a more popular caste made by a magazine writer.* The present study was suggested by neither of these,[[but it has been stimulated by them and others.

* Bib. 387, and E. E. Wardale in an article on the Oxford Dictionary, Appendix E, p. 538. "But the value of the NED. should not end with what it gives us. . . As one turns . . . its pages . . ., all kinds of questions suggest themselves. For instance, why do

[[See "Acknowledgements."

A more complete inquiry into obsolescences and resolution of them than what is offered in these pages will doubtless one day be forthcoming. Such a study at once implies a mind matterfully coping with many eras, not one or two, of English life and letters, and masterfully synthesizing a multitude of matters. This study, in consequence, is modestly offered as a contribution, a piece of pioneering. A complete dissertation would naturally look first to the Old and Middle English periods of our language, fronts upon which some fur has already flown. It would consider, thoughtfully, that distantly brilliant epoch which, in all literary and linguistic seafaring, is beset with the most alluring seamarks, the Elizabethan Age. It would, like a hero of modern fiction,* be compelled to listen once again to the over-luxurious language of seventeenth century divines, and to witness the chastening of our tongue in the next century. It would handle with keen interest the obsolescences of early modern science, 1665[[to Sir Humphry Davy's time; it would

words die out? Why have southright and wanhope disappeared and been replaced by due south and despair? Why has parce-meal been given up and piecemeal been retained? Southright and wanhope are as expressive, as pleasing to the ear, as their modern equivalents, and their meaning must have been more obvious at the time that they were given up; moreover, one would expect that the emotion of despair would take the expression from the native vocabulary of the conquered rather than from the language of the conqueror. . . . Clearly the losses in vocabulary have been due to more than one cause. The introduction of new words is easier to understand. The explanation is obvious in the case of words brought in with . . . new objects. . . . Obvious, too, is the distinction in usage between beef and ox as explained by the swineherd Gurth in Ivanhoe. This dying out of words offers a most interesting field for research, and a wide one--one, moreover, little ex-

* Orlando, in the novel by that name, by Virginia Woolf (Bib. 586.)

[[Date of the first of the "Philosophical Transactions" (Bib. 165.)

possibly grow reminiscent over remarks like those of a great critic of the last century:" it would, in the thought of a scholar of the present,[[not misread, as so many have, the Well of English, but would perhaps, with critical discernment, prognosticate the future.]] Such a study indeed implies much adventuring afield.

But this perfect sort of inquiry does not yet exist, and it is more helpful to consider certain opinions, fragmentary though they often are, and repetitive, of writers and scholars during the past hundred years. The chronology is not uninteresting.((In the period 1832--1850 appeared in English a "treatise on" and "an inquiry into" suffixes, and "On English diminutives" by "G. C. L."

plored as yet, but in which the NED., by giving the dates of quotations used in illustration, should afford valuable help."

* Samuel Taylor Coleridge in the "Literary Remains," 11. 273, given in Bib. 240 (II, Pt. 3.)

[["The well of English has never mistaken increase for defilement." Professor Harry Morgan Ayres, Bib. V, 343.

]] A remark by Professor George Philip Krapp to the effect that an entertaining history of our own times would be intimated in a list of words and senses of words not found in the Oxford Dictionary, is alluded to in "Monument of Words . . ." Wilson Bulletin 3.264, May, 1928. See also Bib. 568, 233, 241, 260, 261, &c., &c.

((Based on A. G. Kennedy's Bibliography (Bib. 19.) Inasmuch as the arrangement of the bibliography of this dissertation is alphabetical, a chronological list is submitted here of more important items: The character of each item is briefly noted, and its place in section V (342 ff.) or VI (419 ff.) of the bibliography.

1832 Lewis, Diminutives, 496
 1834 Nodier, 388
 1838 T. R. Brown, Endings, 437
 1843 Chapin, Suffixes, 440
 1851 Trench, Words, 550
 1855 Fowler, Language, 358
 Latham, Language, 374
 Trench, English PP. 406
 1856 Key, Diminutives, 488
 1857 H. Coleridge, '-let,' 441

1861 Müller, Sci. Lang., 386
 1862 "English Retraced," 357
 Key, Dim. '-let,' 489
 1865 Haldemann, Affixes, 472
 1866 De Vere, Fated Wds., 451
 1867 C. G. S., Correctness, 532
 Whitney, Language, 414
 1869 Blackley, Wd. Gossip, 430
 1870 Marsh, Language, 379
 1872 Obser., New Wds., 516

In the next quarter-century appeared many more books and studies, some now famous (or at least attached to famous names,) and almost all increasingly rich, diverse, and minute in quality. It is interesting to note that much of the work of these Victorians has not, precisely speaking, been superseded. To read Archbishop Trench today is, if not to tread on historical ground, at least

-
- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| 1872 Morris, Affixes, 385 | 1904 Denney., Deriva., 450 |
| 1873 F. Hall, Historical, 364 | 1906 Lidbury, Fashion, 377 |
| 1874 Skeat, Prefix 'a-', 537 | Lounsbury, Words, 503 |
| 1877 Mackay, New Wds., 589 | Schumann, Homonyms, 536 |
| 1876 Green, Change in Mg., 469 | Wyld, Mother T., 418 |
| Mathews, Words, 504 | 1907 Bell, Change, 344 |
| 1877 Davies <u>et al.</u> , Chg. in Mg., 447 | Bodtker, Fr. Wds., 431 |
| 1878 Barrett, Music, | 1910 Chambers, Wds., 439 |
| 1879 Lounsbury, Hist., 378 | Douzat, Language, 352 |
| Tucker, Degraded Wds., 551 | Gadde, Suffixes, 467 |
| 1880 White, Slang &c., 413 | Monroe, Growth, 383 |
| 1882 Welsh, Language, 412 | Moore, 16th C. Views, 384 |
| 1885 Skeat, Ghost Wds., 537 | 1911 Blackburn. Words, 429 |
| 1886 Breal, Semantics, 347 | Klein, Cpds., 490 |
| 1887 Darmesteter, Words, 445 | 1912 A. Ayres, Ill-Use, 422 |
| Garlanda, Fortunes ", 468 | Ossip-Lourie, 393 |
| Hewitt, Obs. Vbs., 366 | Smith, Sea-Terms, 540 |
| 1890 Apperson, Degraded Wds., 421 | Teichert, Old Wds., 547 |
| Meiklejohn, Lang., 381 | 1913 Vossler, Speech, 409 |
| 1891 Koch, Wd.-Formatn., 371 | Wood, Nonce-Wds., 562 |
| Strong, Lang., 402 | 1914 Bloomfield, Lang., 345 |
| 1992 Gummere, Hist. Infiss., 362 | Pearson, Big Wds., 523 |
| 1893 Champneys, Analogy, 349 | Wittmann, Clipped ", 561 |
| 1894 Jespersen, "Prog.", 367 | Weekley, Rom. ", 556 |
| 1896 Davidson, Words, 446 | 1915 Krapp, Rise ELP., 373 |
| 1898 Bray, Crit. Wds., 433 | O'Neill, Slang, 392 |
| Hempl, Lang. Riv., 465 | 1916 Pound, Odd Wds., 525 |
| Matthews, Words, 505 | 1917 Hall, Usage, 363 |
| 1899 Kluge, Ety., 370 | Murison, Change, 387 |
| Nyrop, Hist. Gram, 389 | 1918 Bannard, Music, 423 |
| Padelford, Music, 519 | Matthews, New Wds., 505 |
| White, Use of Wds., 558 | Pound, Affixes, 525 |
| 1900 Schmeding, Carlyle, 534 | 1919 Bridges, Homoph., 434 |
| Sweet, Grammar, 403 | Kerr, Detest. Wds., 497 |
| Toller, Lang., 405 | 1920 Bryan, Cant, 438 |
| Wundt, Speech, 417 | Colton, Losses, 442 |
| 1901 Greenough., Wds., 470 | Pound, French, 525 |
| Koeppel, Semas., 372 | Pulver, Music, 526 |
| 1902 Mead, Wd.-Coin., 507 | Wahlstead, Lang., 410 |
| Oertel, Lang., 390 | 1921 H. M. Ayres, Amer., 343 |
| Ellinger, Twain, 590 | Le Gallienne, Wds., 498 |

in certain passages and literary gestures to feel the closeness of cathedral and churchman. The archbishop's attitude to words is not always our attitude, but he has some sound suggestions for which further proof or explanation is hardly necessary. The names of Muller, Whitney, and Marsh, of Herbert Coleridge and Skeat, famously need no comment.

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, the attention of writers like Darmesteter and Bréal was upon Meanings. Semasiology is somewhat quaintly thought to be a new science, and it cannot exactly be denied that it is. The perspicuous treatment of Bréal (for such French scholarship is often famous,) like the constructive ~~programme~~^{comments} of two much later writers, Ogden and Richards, constitutes a new and refreshing outlook. We might say, ^{again,} that there were numerous semi-scholarly "asides" on the fortunes and worth of words: Green, Mathews, Davies, Tucker, Skeat, Garlanda,

-
- | | | | |
|------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 1921 | Lotspeich, Phon., 502 | Weekley, Words, 556 | |
| | Sapir, Lang., 397 | 1927 | Beach, Archaic, 426 |
| | Tucker, Amer., 407 | | Krapp, Knowl. Eng., 363 |
| 1922 | Denby, Decay, 449 | 1928 | Bradley, Eng., 346 |
| | De Witt, New Wds., 452 | | Gordon, Shak., 361 |
| | Kitchin, Poetic, 369 | | McKnight, Mn. Eng., 380 |
| | Thoma, Lang., 405, 548 | | Miller, Obsol., App. A |
| | Withington, Port. Wds., 560 | | Pillsbury, Psych., 395 |
| 1923 | Bonner, Unfort. Wds., 432 | 1929 | Aiken, Phonetics, 419 |
| | McKnight, Words, 506 | | Anderson, Words, 420 |
| | Mencken, Amer., 382 | | Batchelder, Sea Wds., 425 |
| | Ogden., Semantics, 391 | | Elton, Poetic, 460 |
| | Slosson, Repute. of Wds., 538 | | Groom, Poetic, 481 |
| 1924 | Bell, Myst. Wds., 427 | | Leonard, Correctns., 375 |
| | Delacroix, Lang., 350 | | Weekley, Words, 556 |
| 1925 | Krapp, Eng. L. Amer., 373 | | Williamson, Idioms, 415 |
| | Vendryes, Lang., 408 | | Withington, P. W., 560 |
| | Withington, P. W., 560 | 1930 | Aiken, Eng. PP., 342 |
| 1926 | Barfield, Words, 424 | | Bryant, Law Eng., 348 |
| | Platt, Idioms, 396 | | Jones, Prose Style, 368 |
| | Rainey, Old Wds., 527 | | Leopold, Polarity, 376 |

Apperson, and Brander Matthews. ^{Especially,} ~~More~~ valuable are the writings of Lounsbury and Jespersen, and a unique little book by J. W. Bray (1898) on English critical terms deserves particular mention.

The onflow of books on English, ^{of} ~~and~~ monographs and articles, in the present century to date, has been enormous. It has been left to notes in the bibliography, V and VI, to indicate where many and various obligations lie. It should not be assumed that even most of the items looked into afforded immediate help. Seldom indeed has the "how" or "why" of obsolescence in words been shown or explained. The following collectanea of information and suggestions, though incomplete, attempts to look at the problem from one angle.*

How, precisely speaking, language is never a fixed thing, has been shown many times over. It is, from our point of view, a development in which certain words pass from use or view because of change in things, concepts, forms, ways and means, and modes. This change, whatever else it is, is inevitable. The statement may be thought obvious; but the obvious thing is sometimes overlooked or underestimated, and justly may be allowed to ~~claim~~ ^{demand} ~~claim~~ ^{for} attention. Words and their employment are very much in the path of life, and that path leads always onward. And so, a kind of compulsion attaches to words growing obsolete.

Just what, in any given era, the characteristic development

* Although the order of the material of this study is different from theirs, it has seemed advisable to follow the arrangement of Miss Miller (Appendix A.) Teichert, and others. A helpful classification of V and VI of the bibliography will be found in a footnote, pp. 657 — 661.

of the language is, is a problem not always easy to solve. This is partly so because language in reality is endlessly beset with details and peculiarities, and is evanescent. It is no easy thing to comprehend details, gain a perspective, and summarily characterize the speech of a period.* Just where the strength and weakness of the vocabulary in the Restoration and Queen Anne Periods, and after, lay, it will perhaps be possible to see presently.]]

The language of literature (and the vocabulary) is ultimately dependent on that of life. In the midst of much talk or discussion about style, we are apt to forget the close connexions here between books and people speaking. And so the plans and intimations and aspirations of scientifically-minded men in the Restoration, and the self-assuring impressions of some few literati and critics of the Augustan Age, may not wholly be taken "for what they are worth," but should be attested. They belong in the picture, but the picture is, even linguistically speaking, large. It is a composite, and it is changing. Language lives, and the vocabulary changes with it.]]

Historical events are commonly held to be responsible for

* The studies of J. L. Moore and (especially) S. A. Leonard, Bib. 384 and 375.

[[Bib. 376, the second paragraph of Werner Leopold's article.

]] "A language may not be completely standardized and live. Fixity in the form of a language gives immobility to the . . . thought expressed. . . . The shifting, developing forms assumed by living thought . . . demand the plastic medium of a living language" (McKnight, "English Words," p. 11; Bib. 506.)

"The living vocabulary is no more permanent in its constitution than definite in its extent. It is not today what it was a century ago, still less what it will be a century hence. Its constituent elements are in a state of slow, but incessant dissolution and renovation. Old words are ever becoming obsolete . . . , new words are continually press-

change in vocabulary, especially four: the introduction of Christianity,* the Scandinavian invasions,[[the Norman Conquest,]] and the Renaissance.((Miss Miller in her thesis quotes a most significant message from Pope Gregory to Augustine:)) "For there is no doubt that

* ing on." (Preface to vol. I of NED.) "Language being a living organism obeys the law of all growth, by casting off old tissue and assimilating new" (Le Gallienne, Bib. 498, p. 124 of art.)

* Gummere in his "Germanic Origins," p. 339 (Bib. 362) emphasizes the attack of Christianity on belief: customs and ceremonies were left to disappear by slow stages. Teichert remarks how many words, because of heathen associations, were doomed (App. A,) and Jespersen shows how Christian concepts crept into existing native terms, but adds that Latin and French words often wholly replaced them: husl, weofod ("Growth," pp. 43--44.) More specific studies are by H. S. MacGillivray (Kennedy [AGK] numb. 4055) and Albert Keiser (AGK 4059.)

[[A. D. 737--878. Slightly different forms, dialectal differences, often survived side by side. 'Whole,' 'hale;' 'no,' 'nay;' 'rear,' 'raise;' 'loup' (standard English 'leap,') 'kirk,' 'kirn:' these and others have been cited to point differences in form and meaning (Jespersen, op. cit. Jespersen also points to the Scandinavian predominance in certain fields--industry, shipbuilding, warfare. Pp. 63--73.) See also Teichert, App. A.

] 1066 ff. Various interesting estimates as to dates of greatest influence and change may be found in McKnight, "The Making of English" (Bib. 380 and footnote,) and Bodtker. Jespersen believes the period of strongest influence was 1251--1400. Hempl (Bib. 365) has the thought that when the conquerors consist of a relatively small body, and are the ruling class, the linguistic impress is of terms applying to higher walks of life; and McKnight ("English Words," p. 124) instances the disappearance of orrest, 'battle,' barda, snear (kinds of warships,) seht, 'agreement,' stefan, 'summon,' with 'king,' 'queen,' and 'earl' for contrary examples, and a number of terms of cookery (see also Jespersen, op. cit., pp. 72--73, 86--95.) Meiklejohn (Bib. 381, p. 302) shows how change was facilitated when the French word happened to resemble the native: 'rich,' 'harry,' 'hay;' but he and others also submit many utterly different pairs: wanhope, 'dispair,' 'wantrust,' 'suspicion,' and others.

((G. 1550--1650. Fitzedward Hall (Bib. 364,) G. P. Krapp ("Rise of English Literary Prose," Bib. 373,) and especially J. L. Moore (Bib. 384) show how conscious Elizabethan writers and

) Rhys, "Bede's Ecclesiastical History," p. 53.

it is impossible to efface everything at once from their obdurate minds; because he who endeavours to ascend to the highest place, rises by degrees and steps and not by leaps."^{*} The changes in language in the ninth to the sixteenth century have been much discussed, though it cannot be said that the obsolescence of words belonging to these vast centuries has been fully explained.^{*} The Renaissance Period is especially interesting from the fact that in it men grew language-conscious. In England, it was only after the appearance of Elyot's "Gouernour," 1531, and Ascham's "Toxophilus," 1545, and "Scholemaster," 1570, that considerable criticism during half a dozen decades was written. We have the opinions on language, repetitive in thought and often stichic in form, of 32 men of letters. Elyot championing Latin grace in his "Gouernour" and trying to make the best of it by augmenting the language, Gascoigne and Puttenham concerned for monosyllables and "'bissillables,'" Nashe "culling with loving care" words from the pages of Harvey,[[Wilson and Cheke, purists, "of borrowing," the enthusiastic Harvey, the exact and orderly Richard Carew, the peculiarly lyric John Florio:

critics were of what was happening to their language. See also George Gordon, Bib. 361. Lounsbury intimates as causes of the neologistic tendency the revival of letters and other intellectual impulses, the condition of the church, and the exploration of a new world. Meiklejohn mentions (pp. 175--176) the word-peculiarities of various authors; and McKnight and Barfield distinguish between words filling permanent needs and those belonging to a stream that "flowed too fast . . . for ordinary people . . ." This last point is emphasized elsewhere (Preface to NED vol. 1.)

* See Appendix A, Miller and Teichert. In a somewhat fuller or more extensive reckoning Mrs. J. R. Aiken's "Why English Sounds Change" (Bib. 419) will perhaps be of real assistance. Obviously the phonetic situation here (ninth to sixteenth centuries) is of first importance. See Ch. IV.

[[George Gordon, "Shakespeare's English," Bib. 361.

a resplendent company! These were some of the men, then, who made it their concern to talk about English and to correspond.

Nothing suggests more acutely the kind of manifold richness early modern English enjoyed than the presence in the vocabulary of synonyms of 'obsolete' (&c.) which have themselves become obsolete. Skelton, c. 1525, uniquely used abolete, which possibly begat corrupt progeny in absolent, absolute, and absolute--all "obsolete." Gilpin in 1598 speaks of the "grandam words" of Spenser, and another author (Brerewood, 1612) of "the old forsaken words"--obsolete expressions. Exolete, finally, enjoyed a vogue in the seventeenth century (1611--1705.) What, one wonders, would Stanyhurst, who to our delight offered "For the honour of English" to undertake "a third translation in different words," have thought of this display?

This richness suffered a heavy sea-change. Logomania ascended pulpits with preachers. Minor imitators, translators, and playwrights occasionally became logofascinated, and popular writers and travelers too. Reaction was due, and it came. It manifested itself in more ways than one. Sir John Cheke, first Regius Professor of Greek at Cambridge, produced a Bible with hundreder for 'centurion,' frosent for 'apostle,' biwordes for 'parables,' crossed for 'crucified.'* But Joseph Glanvill in "An Essay Concerning Preaching," 1678, took another writer, Nathaniel Fairfax, to task for similar word-invention (Bib. 249.) John Evelyn wrote an orderly private remonstrance to a friend (Bib. 274.) Hobbes answered Davenant (Bib. 250.) Locke and Wilkins wrote in a formal manner (Bib. 254 and 264.) Sprat,

* From McKnight, "English Words," pp. 115--116.

See also
pp 119
120
footnote

in 1668, spoke for the Royal Society (Bib. 258 and 368.) What came after (that is, in the eighteenth century) has been nicely shown by an Americans scholar (Bib. 375.)

This is wandering somewhat far, however, from "historical events." They may be said, thanks to Brander Matthews,* to be a cause of obsolescence in words in one other way. He speaks of words borrowed in an emergency, especially the Franco-Prussian war terms mitrailleuse and franc-tireur, and compares them "to the foreign laborers who cross the frontier to aid in the harvest and who return to their own country when the demand for their service is over." These words form a class; but there are whole arrays of other words which come with the improvement of knowledge.[] Almost every author who writes about words studies their not always obvious or easily resolved relationships to human activities and fashions.

Finally, we may conceive words to be articles themselves. We do not have to look to fashion in dress and even faith. One is aware, in speaking thus, of the admonitions of Bacon and Locke. But one may also be aware of a pragmatism of William Godwin's concerning things as they are. It cannot be denied that slang

* Bib. 505, "French Words," 1918.

[] Trench in "English Past and Present" and McKnight in "English Words" especially name the vocabularies of armor, archery, hawking, farming, candle-making, manufacture of cloth. . . . Bib. 380, 406, and 578. Marsh, Bib. 379, states (but one does not see how he proves) that seven to eight per cent of English household words went out when linen replaced cotton. But Max Müller parallels other remarks of Marsh with statements concerning German. ("Wortkritik," p. 64.) How natural science changed, so that the heavens shed light on something beyond human destiny, and the coming of a technical vocabulary, are marked by McKnight.

words and oaths especially are articles of fashion. They are all but put on, like clothes. It may be doubted whether "fashion" is "responsible" for the dying out of words elsewhere.* And it is clear that behind fashion and personal prejudice or popular caprice (all of which have been much talked about!) other powers are often at work.

Words, it must be said and resaid, do not pass from use because of one fact. Usually two or more facts or factors are visible in the obsolescence of a word. The danger of classifying obsolescences according to causes is therefore, it is hoped, apparent. But it seems impossible to do without classifications, and it is obvious that only one classification can properly be disposed of at one time. And so writers have named a second large group of causes Linguistic.

* Concerning oaths, see Bib. 518 (unpublished thesis;) also App. G, Addenda, 'Snoons.'

It is noteworthy that though there has been much magazine talk about fashion in words, seldom, on the whole, are more than a few examples offered, and most of them recognizable. From this and other points to be explained in this dissertation it seems reasonable to conclude that fashion alone is not largely responsible for decay in words. E. E. Rainey (Bib. 527) says, "There is a fashion in words as in music, as in art, and as in the hair;" Oertel (Bib. 390,) that the acceptance or rejection of changes depends "on causes which have nothing . . . to do with ease or difficulty or frequency of . . . sound. They are exactly parallel to the spread of fashion" (pp. 144--145;) popularity of word or phrase from use on stage or platform is pointed by Hull, "Fashion in Words," p. 282; Whitney has something to say of caprice ("Life and Growth," p. 100;) Greenough and Kittredge agree that fashion is an influence in change of form and meaning and in wholesale banishment ("Words," pp. 117--124;) Bonner weighs simple words against pseudo-learned polysyllables, and concrete against abstract ("Some Unfortunate Words," p. 785;) and Trench is skeptical of random change or caprice ("Study of Words," p. 310.)

Le Gallienne, "Words we would willingly let die," p. 124 (Bib. 498,) finds consolation in the fact that when words are rushed

Weekley, Trench, Jespersen, Champneys and others, and more recently Mrs. Aiken, speak at length of phonetic change. An organization of opinion here briefly reveals contrasting ideas on "ease" and "economy of effort" and similar matters. Statements, "pro-ease," of a more general nature will be found in two or three of the above-named authors; remarks of a more guarded nature, and more detailed studies belonging properly to the field of phonetic investigation, will be found elsewhere.*

by a large class of pseudo-learned people, they die. But Sophie Kerr in "Detestable Words," pp. 704--705, and Dr. Edwin Slosson and Trench in other places produce words and phrases which by no means have "died," but only have lost or are losing their vigor: 'anxious,' 'grab,' 'catch hold of,' 'the psychological moment,' others. Bibliography VI names other authors who have thought along similar lines; and they are particularly interesting when the element of personal dislike enters.

So much has been written about slang that the subject now seems initially hopeless. At least, a whole book and not a footnote is required here. But the psychology of slang is undeniably intriguing. It is sufficient to say that few have touched on obsolete slang and cant as such.

In contrast, L. P. Smith notes ("Words and Idioms," p. 138, Bib. 541) "a kind of impoverishment [in our language] which is somewhat mysterious in its causes and perhaps impossible to prevent. There is a sort of blight which attacks many of our most ancient, beautiful, and expressive words, rendering them first of all unsuitable for colloquial speech, though they may be still used in prose. Next they are driven out of the prose vocabulary into that of poetry, and are at last removed into that limbo of archaisms and affectations to which so many splendid words of our language have been banished. It is not that these words lose their lustre, as many words lose it, by hackneyed use and common handling; the process is rather the opposite; by not being used enough, the phosphorescence of decay seems to attack them . . . " Teen and rathe are cited, and tryst, sooth, dight, fain, blithe and a few others as belonging only to the realm of poetry.

Foreign competition is sometimes a matter of phonetics and sometimes a matter of real need--and sometimes, it cannot be denied, a matter of fashion. Greenough and Kittredge, p. 25; Whitney, "Life and Growth," p. 100; B. Matthews, "French Words," p. 12; Jespersen, "Growth," p. 113; Marsh, "Lectures," p. 231; Oertel, "Lectures," pp. 143--144; and many others. . .

* Thus, Weekley: "Speaking generally, it may be said that phonetic changes are governed by the law of least resistance, a sound which

Apparently, not so much has been written about homophones, at least as a possible cause of obsolescence in words. An important contribution of Dr. Bridges will be fully considered in its place. Jespersen, Teichert, and Weekley and others have spoken of insignificance in sounds; and a whole critical literature might be made up from what has been thought and said about clipped words and elliptical uses and expressions. Not a few of the celebrated abbreviations of the eighteenth century are still faithfully with us, notably 'mob' and 'pun;' but others are quite obsolete (cit, bub, cloy, crack, crit, dog, chemy) so that it is tempting at first glance to conclude that clipped forms die out. They do, but not just because they are clipped. And the tendency to abbreviate words, like other tendencies (oaths and slang,)

presents difficulty being gradually and unconsciously modified by a whole community of race" ("Romance," p. 55.) Trench: "What men do often they will seek to do with the least possible exertion" 'King' and 'alms' (from cyning and almesse) are cited, and the sound-assimilation in 'summon' and phonetic effect on the writing of seventeenth-century chirurgion and modern 'surgeon' ("Past and Present," pp. 333--334.) Champneys agrees that change comes from the wish to simplify and abbreviate ("Language," pp. 261--264.) Jespersen notes that some writers are in doubt as to the "esse" theory, and declares that we cannot hold to an "all or nothing" plan wherein other influences are undeniably at work.

Krapp, "The Knowledge of English," pp. 364--365, has a caution: "As a comprehensive explanation of the change in speech sounds, the theory of economy of effort is very unsatisfactory. The truth is that any forms of speech that one is familiar with and has frequently produced seem easy and economical compared with less familiar or unknown sounds. Ease and difficulty in speech are very largely relative matters. Modern English asked may seem easy to persons familiar with the word, but the three consonants [skt] coming together are certainly not an easy combination, and Anglo-Saxon ascode . . . , though longer, seems easier to pronounce. The only way to test whether one pronunciation is easier than another would be to apply some method of measuring the physical effort involved. Even then, after one had proved that one sound was easier than the other, it would still be necessary to prove that the difference in ease was the explaining cause of change in a sound, for greater ease of utterance might very well be an accidental consequence."

Apropos "some method of measuring," see Bib. 419 and 502.

works its own peace. Other interesting statements concerning the phonetic activities in words can be found. How a kind of prudery or pedantry may be responsible for reborrowing (or the restoration of foreign pronunciation) is shown by L. P. Smith (Bib. 539:)
'depot,' 'debris,' 'detour,' 'naivete,' 'role,' and the restoration of foreign plurals, 'sanatoria,' 'memoranda,' 'formule,' 'indices.' 'Mediæval' and 'primæval' are also cited. It is somewhat intriguing to read in one place, "there was another word perhaps a little more euphonious to supply [the place of gren] . . . and as gren and gin were not both requisite, consequently the former yielded to the later," and in another, "Would the sound of g in rose . . . be as disagreeable as the same sound when it appears in tose, nose, and other unpoetic words?"* Teichert (App. A, pp. 40 ff. of his dissertation) comments upon 'smack' overcoming 'plat' as being onomatopoeically more emphatic.

Nevertheless, it is possible to postulate but little if we eliminate all but out-and-out obsolescences. As has already been said, in a study which should consider all kinds of obsolete terms from all periods in English history, sound-change would play an important part. But it is necessary to exercise much caution when one deals with words recently departed.

Nothing, after considerable reading, seems to clearly appear as this: that our vocabulary has an over-abundance of forms that are etymologically either related, or isolated, or "untoward" or irregular. Looking back, we might think we detect a kind of restlessness especi-

* Bib. 357 (date 1862) and 373 (date 1927.)

ally among forms having different affixes. Trench, thus, speaks of "an almost unaccountable caprice" in which negatives disappear, and their affirmative complements live on: 'bold,' 'sad,' 'mighty,' 'honest,' 'tame,' but not 'unbold,' &c. An opposite sort of phenomenon is seen in 'uncouth,' 'unwieldy,' 'unmannerly,' 'innocent,' 'invincible,' 'inevitable' ("Past and Present," pp. 210--212.)*

A helpful study of the suffixes -ery, -age, and -ment, by Fredrik Gadde (Bib. 467) will be referred to later. Louise Pound details the vogues affixes may enjoy, either with an author (Carlyle and '-dom,') [or generally (the imported prefixes 'multi-', 'super-', 'counter-', 'pro-', 'anti-', 'ante-', 'post-', 'hyper-', 'pseudo-', and others. Many, she adds, show little chance of permanence.)] The subject seemingly is an attractive one.((

One writer holds that diminutives are fast disappearing.))
Do we indeed prefer auxiliaries? It is possible that a desire to

* Also pp. 215--217, 253--263, 269--271. Trench elsewhere says that suffixes even more than prefixes have undergone change, and cites 'willsome,' 'hearsome,' 'needsome,' 'wantsome,' 'brightsome,' 'poisonsome,' 'gaysome,' 'blinkard,' 'bossard,' 'diggard,' 'drivelard,' 'musard,' 'sheward,' 'leperess,' 'neighboress,' 'sinneress,' 'slayeress,' 'singeress,' 'bakester,' 'brewster,' &c.

[See Bib. 534 (Otto Schmeding.)

] Bib. 525. Fresher terms are always coming in, adds Miss Pound, and gives examples like 'rushee,' 'speedster,' 'bookdom,' 'bootery.' In California, '-eria' still enjoys a great vogue; the author of this dissertation found (besides the famous 'cafeteria') 'hateria,' 'booteria,' 'grocerteria,' 'fruiteria,' and others.

((See footnote to Bib. VI, p. 657.

) Miss Miller, Appendix A. Her reference here is not quite clear, but probably is to Trench.-- "We prefer to express ourselves by the assistance of auxiliaries, and thus we no longer have kingling, twinling, tenderling, dwarfling, fosterling, orphanet, dragonet, queenlet, maidkin, ladykin, thumbkin, laddock and pillock."

banish words has tyrannized over certain critics, and that, in making an approach towards diminutive formations it is better simply to read with care essays by Coleridge, Key, and Lewis. These authors characterize the functions of diminutive suffixes, and make the points that they are occasionally semasiologically superfluous, that they are often localized, and that they are rarely etymologically deceptive. (Bib. 441, 488, 496.)

Frédérich Teichert alone seems to have stressed the interesting and important notion of isolation in the stem as a factor working for obsolescence in words. It is, he thinks, helpful if connected words exist. He points to terms that are utterly isolated and to terms that have but few cognates. He speaks of isolation wherein, because of some vowel-change, a word strays from its family, and of the blight cast upon words when whole families die out. He mentions, finally, the influence of suffixes growing rare and unrecognizable in course of time (Appendix A.)

No perfect line can be drawn always between the etymological and semasiological description of words. The processes of analogy and assimilation have been much discussed, and certainly the meanings of words play a great part in these processes. Champneys and Wyld and others in historical studies and outlines present examples like 'cows' and ky, modor, 'mother,' 'brother.' Trench names three stages in the life of some words: in the first, a word is used in a sense consistent with its root, in the second, a foreign meaning attaches to it, and in the third, a new word thrusts it out. He cites 'preposterous' as an example of generalization in meaning ("Past and Present." pp. 314--318 and 320; see also 311--314 for

discussion of 'meat,' 'corpse,' and 'acre,' as illustrative of an opposite sort of process, called Specialization.)* Teichert gives this process as a cause of obsolescence when a word, coming to mean too many things, is lost in meaning nothing. When, etymologically, relationships are changed or obscured, meanings are apt to diverge widely. 'Cousin' and 'to cozen,' and 'doom,' 'dom,' 'deem,' 'kingdom,' and 'lorn' have been cited.

A glance through the Bibliography, V and VI (footnote to VI, p. 657,) will show that much has been written about "elevation" and "degeneration" in meaning. The noteworthy impression one receives in reading books by Greenough and Kittredge, by Trench and by Weekley, and magazine articles anonymous and signed, is that but few of the words specified have actually been lost to our language. One realizes, of course, that it was not the aim in these books and articles to prove words obsolete. 'Pluck,' 'guts,' 'intestines' have been talked about (Denby and Weekley,) and 'villain' (Denby and Trench;) and 'hussy,' 'wench,' 'child,' and the adjective 'arch' are only a few interesting terms to suggest what happens to words when associated more or less constantly with other words (Weekley, "Romance of Words," p. 83; Trench, "Study of Words," pp. 77--83.)

* Woolbert, "Old Terms and New Needs," pp. 297--301, notes: "Words do not serve for general purposes very long. Always some one steps in and gives them a specific application" The history of words like 'corn,' 'wheat,' 'oats,' 'maize' in England, Ireland, and America, of 'disease,' 'wedlock,' 'tyrant,' and 'myth,' of 'ghost,' of 'weeds' surviving in "widow's weeds," of 'blain' surviving in "chill-blain," and 'mer' in 'mermaid,' 'merman,' and 'wives' in the sense of "women" in the phrase 'old wives' tales,' and 'main' in 'might and main,' is explained by Greenough and Kittredge (pp. 212, 248--249,) Jespersen ("Language," pp. 273--275,) and McKnight ("Words," pp. 95--97.) "There is a constant tendency to give a word an individual meaning which is not shared by other words of its group. In this

As Bonner remarks, the partnership of words is not always lucky,* and the truth may indeed be that men occasionally drag words down with them.[]

Degeneration leads us to think of euphemism. As Greenough and Kittredge remark, this is not a new tendency. A glance at 'death' in Roget's Thesaurus will convince one of the ancientness of euphemism and will also suggest that euphemisms are not precisely subject to becoming obsolete. Oertel thus (p. 304) describes the effect: "The emotional element greatly influences the fate of some words. The taboo on them being, curiously enough, even stricter than on the object which they designate, reverence and prudery alike tend to deplete the vocabulary by prescribing the use of certain words. Their places are filled with words as yet unhallowed or untainted. In these cases of euphemism the new term will usually share the fate of its predecessor and after a certain time also will be supplanted."

Vividness counts for something in the obsolescence of words. Trench recalls annas, one-time synonym of the more suggestive 'pine-apple.' He also names human laziness as a factor, and Kluge ('Etymologisches Wörterbuch," p. xlii) points to 'avunculus' and 'patruus' and others.

A circle of criticism is thus drawn. Unquestionably, more

way a word becomes isolated and does not share the fate of the rest of its group either for obsolescence or survival."

* Bib. 432, "Some Unfortunate Words," 1923.

[] Trench, "Study of Words," pp. 77--83. Bib. 584.

opinions might be found, and some perhaps would suggest other causes of obsolescence, other ways of looking at words and thinking about them. Indeed, not the least helpful and efficacious reading for the present study has been in books not on words or language.* Yet it is true that these books and writings, like those of more immediate concern, constitute indeed a circle: in them, one circumvents the subject. And in the center lies the word, often enigmatical, always intriguing, wholly indispensable.

In point of fact, the New English Dictionary is a treasure-house of words. Its praises have been intelligently sung by many, many writers, both named and unnamed; it has been criticized both roughly and with kindly care; it has been stigmatized as "essentially literary," as having been done in "indecent haste;" it is being supplemented.†

It is true that our greatest dictionary seldom suggests directly reasons for the obsolescence of words. Neither, satisfactorily, do other dictionaries: it is not their province. Dr. Johnson, as will presently be shown, liked to condemn words to death sometimes; and some of the terms he tried to excommunicate from the vocabulary have actually passed from remembrance since his day. But his attitude was not always a reasoning attitude. And so what the New English Dictionary on "Historical Principles" has to say of 'daguerreotype' and under 'logomacice,' 'endenmost,' 'ferricalcite,' and many scientific terms, perhaps is, as illustrating why words become obsolete, more virtuous than what Dr. Johnson had to say of 'uncomeatable,'

* Bib. VII, numbers 572, 580, and 586, e. g.

† Appendix E, Bib. 14 and 288.

'coxcomical,' and a host of others.

What the Oxford Dictionary does do (as is well known) is to mark "Obs." and "Obs. Rare" many hundreds of words. The reader will find, in Appendix B, a tabulation whose figures are not uninteresting. More than one-fifth of the main words are, according to figures in the Dictionary, obsolete; and according to a count made for this study, a little less than one-third (some 18,600 out of 52,464)) were in all probability never used more than once or not used at all. One wonders how and why some of these words were ever created. The vast majority are not ~~marked~~^{called} nonce. The attitudes toward some of them, both at the time of creation or use and subsequently, are to be marked--carefully. Words are often used apologetically.* And then they are rediscovered, either by perusers of books, casually, or by deliberate critics, and a supposition is frequently at once struck upon, namely, that such-and-such a word was an "unsuccessful candidate for admission into the language."[[

Yet the concern of this study is with all obsolescences of the Restoration and Queen Anne Periods and afterwards. One cannot, for all the critical markings of scholarship, be sure about the circulation of words. One cannot even be sure of the obsolescence of all obsolescences.]] Like that remarkable character in a charming play for children, the King's English in "The Poor Little Rich Girl," obsolescences have a way of getting up again. An interesting example is

* See Ch. III, p. 65.

[[Contrast this heading in Miss Miller's thesis, App. A, with remarks by Professor George Gordon, Bib. 361.

]] The following are but a few of the words marked "? Obs." in the

chemy, and another is hold as used in music ("♩.")

Not all of the obsolescences collected for this study, however, are herein presented. The aim in collecting between ten and fifteen thousand was a desire to be eclectic. Because we cannot be sure, in any final analysis, about obsolete words and their like, it is well not only to have an abundance of material, but to be able to select from that abundance what seems choicest and most to the point. Perfection has at least been aimed at.

If even a small measure of perfection is attained, much credit must⁸⁰ to the great Oxford Dictionary. It has a kind of vast lexicographical ancestry which tells a deeply interesting story of progress made from words treated like desirable and undesirable subjects to words handled impersonally and historically. It is a work not without unavoidable shortcomings. No one, for example, will ever know what words failed to get from low life into the NED. And though the words are handled impersonally, the Dictionary itself takes on personality for him who reads it extensively. One of the great regrets of makers of dictionaries is that they never catch up with the language. But, in the thought of an Old Testament passage,* with the New English Dictionary now at hand, marvellous in its completion, we can at last both run and read.

NED: afflictedness (1650,) altercation (1731, 1737,) amissness (1648,) anecdotarian (compare 'anecdotographer,') apathic (1836,) astriferous (1656, 1677,) ball (v², "to play at ball," 1631,) Cæcias (1653--1824,) chubbed (1647 ff.,) cannule (1718,) creolians (1702 ff.,) foiblesse (foreignism, 1635 ff.,) frache (1662--1832,) furriery (1784,) gialbolins (1723, 1841,) huzzard, prestigiate (1647, 1716;) also numerous misprints: chertishness, enlargement, enlongate, luteon, parricidous, suffle, tenedish, &c., "ghosts," as Professor Skeat would say.

* Habakkuk, ii. 2.

CH. II

Remarks concerning the English vocabulary and changes in language are too interesting in themselves to be passed over. If one is seeking the real reasons why words become obsolete, one is not likely, to be sure, to find them in thoughts flowering in the poetry of Horace or Chaucer.* And neither is one sure to find them in abstruse and scholarly writing. Not infrequently the thinker thinks too deeply. He is captivated by his word and, not unlike a will o' the wisp, it leads him into strange places. Nevertheless, if we wish to know what was thought and said about words and their ways, if we wish to add to our knowledge and strengthen our critical ^{insight} ~~power~~, we must go to the thinker and we shall not do unwisely if we listen to the poet.

Some of the ways in which our language became copious in the sixteenth century and after, the next chapter will essay to show. The Elizabethans were probably the first clearly to see linguistic growth and change and to talk about them.[[One is especially impressed by the personal note everywhere, in all sorts of critical writing; and it is a characteristic that is still with us today because so human. A particularly interesting figure is Richard Carew, who wrote about "The Excellency of the English Tongue" at the close of the century.]] It seems obvious that one cannot talk about the

* See notes under Blount, Bib. 270.

[[Ante, p. 10, and Bib. 364, 373, 384, 387, 379, and 399.

]] G. Gregory Smith (Bib. 399,) 11. 285 ff. "1595--6"

obsolescence of words until words are consciously felt to be abundant. Neither Carew nor others for quite some time made utterance about obsolete words, but often they did pass judgment: they had much to say about Inkhorn and Oversea Terms and Poetic Diction.* Carew is particularly interesting because he championed the language even to the point of writing: "Yes, soe significant are our wordes, that amongst them sundry single ones serue to expresse diuers thinges; as by Bill are ment a weapon, a scroll, and a birdes beake; by Graue, sober, a tombe, and to carue; and by light, marcke, match, file, sore, & praye, the semblable." About three quarters of a century later, Bishop Wilkins wrote an amazingly similar passage,† but drew an altogether different conclusion. A change of leaven making for a new bread of language.

Apparently it was not until 1650 and afterwards that words were again criticized by many writers. In the middle of the century two voices and an oracle spoke. The oracle and one of the voices are not

* See the index to Smith's two volumes (Bib. 399,) English Language and Vocabulary. Carew is also interesting for his remarks on the copiousness of English, on borrowing and "encrease" (mode of) therefrom (Smith, ii. 291:) "For our owne partes, we imploye the borrowed were soe far to our aduantag that we raise a profit of new woordes from the same stock, which yeat in their owne country are not merchantable; for example, wee deduce diuers wordes from the Latine which in the Latyne self cannot be yealded, as the verbes To Aire, beard, cross, flame, and their deriuations ayring, ayred, bearder, bearding, bearded, &c."

† The editor in his introduction (pp. lv to lx) gives a splendid synthesis of what critical writers knew (or were conscious of) and wished to do. Definite and important as the corpus of thought and judgment is (esp. pp. lvii and lix,) the media ought always to be kept in mind--notes of instruction, private letters, epistles not without a quaint formality, an apology that is also a defence. This explains in part the attitude of all towards words and language --Carew, Sidney, E. K., Jonson, Nashe, Harvey.

† Bib. 264.

important.* Indeed, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there were many lesser utterances. But the remarks of Thomas Hobbes are of some significance as showing in what way the vocabulary was increasing (Bib. 250.) Hobbes does not exemplify, but perhaps that was unnecessary. Examples were forthcoming. John Evelyn in a letter to Sir Peter Wyche, 1665 (Bib. 247,) names causes of increase and corruption, and proposes twelve cures. In 1668, Thomas Sprat pleaded, in behalf of the Royal Society, for primitive purity (Bib. 258 and 363;) and in the same year appeared Bishop John Wilkins' extensive work on a philosophical language, alluded to above. Joseph Glanvill early saw the truth about the Well of English in a sane little essay concerning preaching, 1678 (Bib. 249 and p. 4 above.) The famous Essay of John Locke (Bib. 254) appeared in 1690; and at the end of the century came a word of advice from John Hughes--the avoiding of all obsolete words (Bib. 251.)

Quite a number of informal comments and criticisms appeared in the eighteenth century.[Two of the most interesting are earliest: Swift in the "Tatler," 1710, and subsequently elsewhere (Bib. 260,) and Addison in the "Spectator," 1711. Both are famous. Swift emphasizes in his "Proposal" of 1712 the notion of corruption, to be sure; but when we recall our man the Dean in his myriad moods and intimacies, his picture of Dunces with "Credit enough to give Rise to some new Word" takes on life and real value. If Swift's examples are few, they are also to the point, choice. The fate of Cant is about as well described as it ever has been in the essay on Genteel Conversation (1738.)

* Davenant, Bib. 243, and Fuller, Bib. 248.

[See especially the late Professor Leonard's study (Bib. 375.)

In the August of 1711 Addison celebrated the economy of English: its silences, monosyllables, clipped vocables, and telescoped phrases. This was in "Spectator" No. 135. In the following month he presented in the same journal (No. 165) an exceedingly bright and fanciful essay on the corruption of English through the importation of French terms. The complaint was ^{not} ~~perhaps already~~ ^{new} aging, but the treatment naively was Addison's.

Berkeley, from 1709 on, in various writings emphasized the peril of words--the insecurity of meanings--and other matters (Bib. 236.) The remarks of John Dennis, 1711, like those of Davenant long before, are vague (Bib. 243 and 244.) Budgell in the "Spectator" for May 8, 1712 (Bib. 237) has the suggestion that depraved minds and mean education lie behind misused words. Johnson, outside of his Dictionary, has but little to say of words (but see Bib. 253 and 132.) There is a delightful article on the abuse of words, especially 'ruin,' by Colman and Thornton (Bib. 241;) and from the mid-century on, a great increase of books and essays of all kinds on language calls for a separate study.

One wishes that a critic like John Dryden (Bib. 246) had written more. His comments on language and words are scattered and fragmentary, and at least one of them, about trading with both living and dead for the enrichment of English, is famous. His appreciation of "sounding" words is also well-known. In all his vacillation between Romantic and Classic, his appreciation of English remained secure. Early in life he wrote, "I know not whether I have been so careful of the plot and language as I ought; but, for the latter, I have endeavored to write English, as near as I could distinguish it from the tongues of pedants;" and at the close of life, "Good heavens!

how the plain sense is raised by the beauty of words!" (Professor Ker's edition, ii. 250.) When he apologizes for modernizing Chaucer, he writes (Ker, ii. 267,) "Words are not like landmarks, so sacred as never to be removed; customs are changed, and even statutes are silently repealed, when the reason ceases for which they were enacted." Sanity was ever a faithful handmaid of Dryden, and his last years were attended by mellowing influences.

Bishop Wilkins' work on Language (1668, Bib. 264) is a large Book partly because it was done in leisure. Wilkins thought of all change as "a gradual corruption," and added, "in some few hundred years a Language may be so changed as to be scarce intelligible; then, in a much longer tract of time it may be quite abolished, none of the most radical and substantial parts remaining." He thought of equivocals as being a chief defect in language, and, for English, pointed to 'bill,' 'grave,' and others. Common words like 'break,' 'come,' 'draw,' 'hand,' 'keep,' 'lay,' 'set,' metaphorically and otherwise have taken on often thirty and forty senses. "And though the varieties of Phrases in Language may seem to contribute to the elegance and ornament of Speech; yet, like other affected ornaments, they prejudice the native simplicity of it, and contribute to the disguising of it with false appearances. Besides that, like other things of fashion, they are very changeable, every generation producing new ones." The bishop calls on his own age to bear witness.

Synonyms, Wilkins believes, "make Language tedious;" yet he interestingly shows how no language is immune, and how the Arabic has 1000 several names for 'sword,' 500 for 'lion,' 200 for 'serpent,' and four score for 'honey.' Anomalisms and differences in writing and pro-

nunciation are spoken of, and variation in the senses of words by trope, synecdoche, metonymy, and irony. A dictionary (Bib. 303) with elaborate suggestions concludes the great volume.

The first edition of Locke's "Humane Understanding" (Bib. 254) appeared in 1690. It is a handsome folio volume of 362 pages. Book III, pp. 185 to 260, has to do with words, and is not only clear reading, but often delightful. More than once, Locke uses the word (and idea of) 'gold' to point his meaning: "It is evident, that each can apply it only to his own Idea; nor can he make it stand, as a Sign of such a complex Idea as he has not." Thus men commonly suppose they use words in their commonly accepted meanings; they often suppose words to stand for things, and they thus set their minds on words, not things. Locke points out how far it is beyond human power to remember everything met; wherefore everything cannot have a peculiar name. Even if it were possible, more knowledge could not come from such a heaping up of names (Ch. III, fig. 3.) The word 'essence' is considered in its various significations, and the conclusion drawn, "Man making abstract Ideas, and settling them in their Minds, with Names annexed to them, do thereby enable themselves to consider Things, and discourse of them, as it were in bundles, for the easier and readier improvement, and communication of their Knowledge, which would advance but slowly, were their Words and Thoughts confined only to Particulars."

One rarely finds fancy and critical insight so happily wedded as in Ch. IV, fig. 10. "The Act of Perspicuous, as far forth as perspicuous, is another Peripatetick definition of a simple Idea; which though not more absurd than the former of Motion, yet betrays its Uselessness and Insignificancy more plainly, because Experience will easily convince any one, that it cannot make the meaning of the Word Light

(which it pretends to define) at all understood by a blind Man . . . When the Cartesians tell us, that Light is a great number of little Globules, striking briskly on the bottom of the Eye, they speak a little more intelligibly than the Schools: but yet these Words never so well understood, would make the Idea, the Word Light stands for, no more known to a Man that understand it not before, than if one should tell him, that Light was nothing but a Company of Little Tennis-balls, which Fairies all Day long stook with Rackets against some Men's Fore-heads, whilst they passed by others."

In Ch. IX, Locke speaks "Of the Imperfection of Words." He names the unavoidable doubtful significations arising from the use of words wherein we record our own thoughts and wherein we communicate them to other people. Especially, says Locke, where ideas are complex, or where the ideas that words stand for have no certain connexion in nature, or where they are referred to a standard not easily known, or where the real signification of the word and the exact essence of the thing are not the same, trouble arises. All of this is especially true of the language of philosophy; "Common use regulates the Meaning of Words pretty well for common Conversation." Words like 'honor,' 'grace,' 'religion,' 'church,' Locke thinks, are especially confusing. Ideas change, perhaps become impoverished: and there is your word with its old associations lurking dangerously about. 'Gold' is cited for at least the third time. Each man defining it appeals to a different standard in nature: its weight, its color, its malleability, its fusibility, its solubility, its ductibility. From which it will always unavoidably follow, declares Locke, that men, having complex ideas in mind, will always vary in opinion concerning them.

Words, thus, may be in themselves imperfect; but when they are abused, the human element, wilful neglect, enters (Ch. X.) Locke here particularizes four kinds of abuse: words in their first use not standing for clear ideas, the continued use of indistinct terms by people, the affected obscurity of old words applied to new and unusual significations, and words taken for things. Trouble is mainly apparent in the realms of philosophy, religion, and peripatetick thought. In XI, Locke proposes remedies; and he has a brief passage on dictionaries which might nicely be compared to what Sir Thomas Urquhart and Bishop Wilkins also thought.

John Locke has been thus detailed because, when compared with others,* he is found to have spoken so clearly and fully. It cannot be claimed for him that his ideas are peculiar to him, though in a historical study it may be overlooked that a man's thoughts may be quite original with him. But Locke's expression is peculiar to him, and in an enquiry like the above, expression is deeply valuable.

If we look elsewhere for more casual comments on words and their ways, we are bound not to be disappointed. Indeed, their name might be found to be legion. Thus Urquhart, who will be alluded to several times in this study,† writes of words, "Seeing there is in nature such affinity 'twixt words and things," in the Preface to "Jewel:" they should vary or agree as "the things themselves which are conceived by them do in their natures." And, things outnumbering words, languages borrow, and become beholden to one another. Swift's caricature of the professor in "Gulliver's Travels" is well-

* See Ch. II, "Words," in Ogden and Richards (Bib. 391.)

* Bib. 198 and pp. 66, 106, 107, 115ff, 141-142, 301, 345, 365; also Bib. 599, 601. X

known, and is probably, like so many other passages in this famous book, distasteful--at least to some professors. "He assured me . . . that he had emptied the whole vocabulary into his frame, and made the strictest computation of . . . particles, nouns, and verbs . . . The first project was to shorten discourse by cutting polysyllables into one, and leaving out verbs and participles; because, in reality, all things are but nouns. . . . The other project was . . . for abolishing all words whatsoever; and this was urged as a great advantage in point of health as well as brevity. For it is plain that every word we speak is, in some degree, a minution of our lungs by corrosion, and consequently [shortens] our lives" (Pt. 3, Ch. 5.)

Satire without bitterness will be found in Motteux' translation of Rabelais. The reader will perchance recall the inimitable passage in which Pantagruel and his companions, arriving in the Country of Congealed Words, hear them as they thaw. One big one in Fryar Jhon's hands (says Rabelais) gave a noise like Chestnuts thrown into the fire. "I would fain have sav'd some merry odd Words, and have preserv'd them in oil, as Ice and Snow are kept, and between clean Straw: But Pantagruel would not let me, saying, that 'tis a folly to hoard up what we are never like to want, or have always at hand, odd, quaint, merry and fat Words of Gules never being scarce among all good and jovial Pantagruelists." (IV. 56.)

The sense of apology with which words are often used will be dwelt upon presently.* Numerous other comments will be found in the bibliography.† Readers of Sterne will recall Uncle Toby on

* Ch. III, p. 65; see also Bib. 43 and 209.

† Swift, Bib. 188; Motteux, 154; Browne on 'grasshopper' (&c.,) 51;

high-sounding words in '-ical,'* and Gurth on the distinction between 'beef' and 'ox' in Ivanhoe,^{[[} and similar particulars in literature. A comment of a direct character, and charming, is made by E. S. Barrett's Heroine in the novel by that name (Bib. 570,)

"As I had studied elegance of attitude before I knew the world, my graces were original, and all my own creation; so that if I had not the temporary mannerisms of a marchioness, I had, at least, the immortal movements of a seraph. Words may become obsolete, but the language of gesture is universal and sternal."

But these comments are, as has been remarked, casual, and at most constitute only an interlude. We turn to the Dictionaries.--

In attitude and method, most of the dictionaries between Cockeram's and Bailey's (1623 to 1721) are of a pattern. Cotgrave's dictionary is a large one, but the others are chiefly small; in most, there is a sifting of words, with judgment passed. One finds ambitious advertisements, boastful prefaces, laments (as over a "presumptuous and far-fetching of words,") select lists. Old words (i. e., obsolete) are often marked with an asterisk, or are simply called "Old." But prefatory comments on them are few.

One of the earliest was Bullokar's (Bib. 271.) The Huntington Library copy of 1656, uniform with the tenth ed. of Cockeram ("H. G., Gent.," 1655,) is a dainty book with a short introduction:

Cavendish on words as pencillings, 63; Gayton, 104; Glanvill, 105, 249; L'Estrange, 139; Panciroli, 160; Swift, 183; Whitlock, 209; Wood, 211.

* Bk. I, Ch. XXI; also Bk. III, Ch. VIII. Infra, p. 314.

[[Supra, p. 3, footnote.

"Have care to search every word according to the true Orthography thereof, as for Phoenix in the letter P, not in F, for Hypostatical in Hy: not in Hl. Remember also that every word marked with this mark * is an old word, onely used of some ancient Writers, and now grown out of use. Lastly, if a word be of different significations, the one easie, the other more difficult, I onely speak of the interpretation of the hardest; as in the words Ten ['Tenne:'] orange or tawny color among heralds], Girle ["A Roe Buck of two years"], Garter ["It sometime signifieth the principal of our English Hearlds, called the King at Armes"] may appear." Not a few of the terms in this entertaining little volume were marked, as promised, with *—139. One is surprized to find (in Bullokar's spelling) words like aile, Alderam (starlin Leo,) aye, bale, fangs, glee, and laron asterisked; yet with a complete list* before one,

* Aile, to be sickoor diseased, whence our question, What ail-eth thee? ... from the Saxon, alde, i. e. sickness; Alderam; Alnath, star in the horns of Aries; Aye, for ever. Bale, sorrow, great misery; Bardes, poets; Bargaret, kind of dance; Barbican, Bulwark--Arabic; Barn, Bearne, child; Baudkin, tinsel; Baine, bath; Behight, promise, vow; Benison, blessing; Bode, fortell; Bourne, well-spring or fountain-head, also brook; Burled, armed. Camoyse, crooked upward: nose of a black Moore; Caneline, chamlet; Gleeped or Yleeped, called; Cop, head; Coppill, little tuft on the top of the head; Couth; Croft, close; Crop, top of anything. Daffe, dastard; Dags, latches cut of leather; Dene, valley; Denwere, doublet; Dune; Ecke, piece out; Eld. Fangs, hands, clutches, jaws, teeth; Frape, rabble, company; Fremd, strange. Galiard, lusty; Galoch, shoe; Galpe, belch; Gaurd, stare; Geriful, changeably, sometimes cruel; Geiseran, breastplate; Gild, fraternity; Gippon, doublet; Gipsere, bag; Gisarme, certain weapon; Gite, gown; Glee, joyfulness; Gleire, white; Glinne, little village; Gnarre, hard knot in wood; Gnosse, fool, churl; Glierdise, one with a foul great mouth; Ginsfernon, a little flag; Grame, sorrow; Graythed, devised; Gretch, apparel; Gree, goodpart; Grith, agreement; Guerring, brawling; Gyre, a trance. Hailse, charge; Haine, hated; Haketon, sleeveless jacket; Halse, neck; Halke, corner, valley; Hameled, cut off; Harrow, away! fie! Hauselins, breeches; Hawback, to return; Howgates, how. I-

it is possible to see one aspect of what has been called "the sifting process." This aspect becomes more vivid when one holds the tiny volume in hand, and compares its contents with the contents of other similar books. These early lexicographers indeed played a kind of game with the vocabulary of our language, and often delighted to sort words; but few compilers of them in the seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries surpassed Bullokar in detecting age in words.

Thomas Blount thus, whose mid-seventeenth century "Glossographia" is fairly well known, and makes rather intriguing reading (Bib. 270,) has little to say of obsolete words. He laments the affecting of a kind of novelty in speech and the recalling of "oreworn and uncouth words," and likewise the "presumptuous and farfetching of words" mentioned above; he artistically quotes Horace and Chaucer concerning change in language. Henry Cockeram's diction-

cond, learned; Jewise, gibbet; Ifere, gather; Ifretten, devoured; Ikend, known; Ilke, same; Imeint, mingled; Interesse, lining. Joleyning, joyful; Jonglerie, juggling; Jub, bottle. Iwympled, muffled. Memelling, brewers vessel; Kepe, care, castle, regard; Kenysrd, micker, hedge-creeper. Larson, robbery; Lawne, plain untilled ground; Laye, song; Layvers, thongs of leather; Lectorn; Lede, the old name for March; Legisters, lawyers; Levesell, bush; Liard, nimble; Londe-manage, skill in navigation; Lore; Lorrel, devourer; Louke, fellow receiver; Louting, bowing, bending; Lushborough, base coin: Edw. III; Manqueler, murderer. Narre, neerer; Nil-ling, unwilling; Nim, to .. catch. Palliard, whooremonger; Palliardise, whooredom. Roun, tell in the ear. Sibbe, one of kin; Snugly, safely; Sprent, sprinkle; Strand, seaside; Surcote, a gown with a hood; Surquedry, presumption; Sweven, dream; Swynk, labor; Swynker. Taaw, heap; Tapinage, secrecy, sliness; Teen, sorrow; Thilk, same; Thirle, pierce; Threpe, affirm; Vechons, hedgehogs; Uneth, scarce, hardly, with difficulty. Wanger, male; Warison, reward; Wastelbread, fine cinnamon; Waymenting, lamenting; Weald, wood; Weene, think; Welked, withered; Wend, go; Wold, wood; Wone, store; Woodshaw, woodside, shadow; Woorts, herbs; Wicke, to take revenge upon; Wreme, compass about. Yede, went.

ary, also mentioned above, essayed not only what its sub-title promised, an interpretation "of hard English Words," but the assorting of "the choicest words," and vulgar, mock, and fustian terms and proper names (Bib. 274.) The lists are entertaining; a comparison with John Bullokar's information is, if not instructive, at least interesting; but there is little about obsolete words.* Elisha Coles published, in 1676 (Bib. 275,) a dictionary which (with an eye to the preface) boastfully undertook "the difficult Terms .. in Divinity, Husbandry, Physick, Philosophy, Law, Navigation, Mathematicks, and Other Arts and Sciences." He makes one statement of some significance: "I have not only retained, but very much augmented the number of Old Words. For though Mr Blount (as he saies expressly) shunn'd them, because they grew obsolete; yet doubtless their use is very great: not only for the unfolding those Authors that did use them, but also for giving a great deal of light to other words that are still in use."

* Among the "Polite" words: Abandon, Abate, Arblaster (cross-bow,) Aye; Bile (the "humors,") Bardes, Bayne (bath,) Benison, Blithe; Denweer, Dentiate (to breed teeth, not asterisked;) Eld, Enewed (made new;) Hopesteer (pilot of a ship,) Horrow (beastly, base, slanderous,) Howgates, Howton (how,) Hulsterd (hidden,) Hurtelen (thrust;) Jocond (learned,) Jewise (gallows,) Ifretton, Ikent. . . . The reader is entreated to search for 'physiognomy' under 'P,' not 'F' (&c., compare Bullokar;) and section II gives examples like 'circumvolate' and 'inhibit' or 'interdict' as being more delicate than 'fly round about' and 'forbid.' Even 'golden sands' is not elegant enough, and 'Pactolean Sands' is recommended.

The writer has had not time to look with care, as he should like to do, into these companion volumes. The edd. used at the Huntington Library were in every way practically twins. Where Bullokar begins with 'abandon,' Cockeram begins with 'abacted.' "H. C." does not mark 'Mamacterian' (the "moneth" of September) obsolete (contrast 'Alderam' and 'Ainath' in "I. B.,") nor 'palliard,' 'gnarre,' 'gleire,' 'glinne,' 'goff,' 'goliardize,' 'manqueller,' 'sibb,' 'itinerate,' and others. Because Cockeram outstrips Bullokar, any very full comparison is impossible.

Such an attitude is indeed rare! A few examples are perhaps not uninteresting. Abstemious, "sober, temperate," has returned to us. Eld, galiard ("merry,") galloshoes ("outward shoes or cases for dirty weather,") glee, gleire ("white,") galpe ("to belch,") and a few others are found here as elsewhere (footnote, p. 34.)

Galiard and "galloshoes" are particularly interesting to us today. The one we still know, if only as an archaism; the other we cannot do without in wintry weather. Our dictionaries do not mark 'gaud' (Coles' gaude) obsolete; but it may be owned that 'ornament,' 'trinket,' and 'gewgaw' contain more imagery or are phonetically more enticing. . . . Edward Cocker (Bib. 273) in his dictionary of 1715 considered Spenser to be especially obsolete, and his obsolescence a probable blemish, "it being equally faulty to adhere obstinately to words out of use as fondly to affect new ones." And like the others, he attempted to set the vocabulary aright in the midst of an inundation. Indeed, these early dictionaries were something like "Follow the Leader;" and it is a relief at length to find a distracting and dangerous book like the "Ladies Dictionary" of "N. H." (1694; Bib. 282.)

There was thus a great piling up of words in the second half of the seventeenth century and the early eighteenth century. It was not unattended by controversy (Blount's accusation of plagiarism levied at Edward Phillips' "New World" and "Nomothetes;") there was considerable striving with different levels of diction; and the work produced, even as respects obsolete terms, was much of a pattern. But the pattern is not without interest. It cannot be denied that age lurks in some words. Eld was marked, and many other words with it: it was altogether natural that Bullokar should

have put an asterisk by it. If he had not, a later comer would have done as much. Their feeling concerning words like eld was our feeling. Taste elsewhere, as, for instance, respecting elegance in words, was an altogether different matter, and is curious to us; but the feeling concerning "old words" was both genuine and quite reasonable. Bullokar spoke vaguely of "some ancient Writers," but Coles named Chaucer, Gower, "Pierce Ploughman," and Julian Barnes.

Nathaniel Bailey (Bib. 267) detailed some causes of obsolescence in language (or rather change) in the introduction of his dictionary. It appeared in 1721 and aimed to give all words. There were many later editions. Dr. Johnson interleaved one—that of 1730—and used it as a kind of work-shop for his own elaborate work of 1755. Bailey was probably the first to state carefully the causes of change in language; and his remarks have been echoed or enlarged upon by others than Dr. Johnson. Johnson must have had Bailey's preface much in mind, though he had somewhat more to say.* Bailey specified the commigrations and conquests of nations and pointed to the Italian tongue; he named commerce as a second cause, wherein names of offices, dignities, and wards, and terms of traffic are altered or introduced; and the art of imitation, he believed, was a third potent factor. Imitation carried with it, in the thought of Bailey, not only linguistic change, but insured the permanence of treasured knowledge. He detailed still further certain changes in English--its blendings, its regularizing and purging from within, its self-embellishing.

* The writer regrets the loss of a reference to an interesting article, c. 1927, which compares the two dictionaries.

Finally, the words disused are called, in Bailey's lists, either "old" (accoy, adashed, to adent, algate, anlace, aprize, &c.) or "from Chaucer" (abawed, "abashed, daunted," abide, "forbear," abote, afare, &c.) And this is all.

Dictionaries, it has been held, enbalm the language. It may be questioned, however, whether Dr. Johnson in his superb work of 1755 wished or tried to enbalm his language. The Preface touches somewhat eloquently on the point. It may be questioned whether Johnson even wished to "fix" English, either for his own day or all time. What he did attempt in those great folio pages was to point out, as he thought, certain linguistic Charybdises. Time has shown that, etymologically speaking, he fell into at least a few Scyllas. But his judgment of words, and occasionally flagrant definitions of them ('lexicographer,' 'network,' 'oats,' 'whig,' 'tory,' 'excise,' 'pensioner,') are at worst but human. The story of the Dictionary has been so often told that it is left to an appendix to indicate what is possibly significant. Our concern is with his obsoletisms, and we shall look first at the Preface and then at a few words themselves.

The prefatory comments are, to be sure, fragmentary, but are often neatly turned and pointed. "Obsolete words are admitted, when they are found in authors not obsolete, or when they have any force or beauty that may deserve revival." We remember the words of Elisha Coles, above, and perhaps recall a sentiment of Richard Grant White's about the impossibility of obsolete literature. Again, "Words are seldom exactly synonymous; a new term was not introduced, but because the former was thought inadequate. . . . The

original sense of words is often driven out of use by their metaphorical acceptations." Words sometimes also come into "an exuberance of signification." The bare existence of terms of agriculture, manufacture, and the like, is mentioned.

"Total and sudden transformations of a language seldom happen; conquests and migrations are now very rare: but there are other causes of change, which, though slow in their operation, and invisible in their progress, are perhaps as much superior to human resistance, as the revolutions of the sky, or intumescence of the tide. Commerce, however necessary, however lucrative, as it depraves the manners, corrupts the language. They that have frequent intercourse with strangers, to whom they endeavor to accommodate themselves, must in time learn a mingled dialect, like the jargon which serves the traffickers on the Mediterranean and Indian coasts. This will not always be confined to the exchange, the warehouse, or the port, but will be communicated by degrees to other ranks of people, and be at last incorporated with the current speech.

"There are likewise internal causes equally forcible. The language most likely to continue long without alteration, would be that of a nation raised a little, and but a little, above barbarity, secluded from strangers, and totally employed in procuring the conveniences of life; either without books, or, like some of the Mahometan countries, with very few: men thus busied and unlearned, having only such words as common use requires, would perhaps long continue to express the same notions by the same signs. But no such consistency can be expected in a people polished by arts, and classed by subordination, where one part of the community

is sustained and accommodated by the labour of the other. Those who have much leisure to think, will always be enlarging the stock of ideas, and every increase of knowledge, whether real or fancied, will produce new words, or combinations of words. When the mind is unchained from necessity, it will range after convenience; when it is left at large in the fields of speculation, it will shift opinions; as any custom is disused, the words that expressed it must perish with it, as any opinion grows popular, it will innovate speech in the same proportion as it alters practice.

"As by the cultivation of various sciences, a language is amplified, it will be more furnished with words deflected from their original sense; the geometrician will talk of a courtier's zenith, or the excentrick virtue of a wild hero, and the physician of sanguine expectations and phlegmatick delays. Copiousness of Speech will give opportunities of capricious choice, by which some words will be preferred, and others degraded; vicissitudes of fashion will enforce the new, or extend the signification of known terms." Thus, "the tropes of poetry will make hourly encroachments, and the metaphorical will become the current sense: pronunciation will be varied by levity or ignorance, and the pen must at length comply with the tongue; illiterate writers will at one time or other, by publick infatuation, rise into renown, who, not knowing the original import of words, will use them with colloquial licentiousness, confound distinction, and forget propriety. As politeness increases, some expressions will be considered as too gross and vulgar for the delicate, others as too formal and ceremonious for the gay and airy; new phrases are therefore adopted, and must, for the same reasons, be in time dismissed. Swift, in his

petty treatise on the English language, allows that new words must sometimes be introduced, but proposes that none should be suffered to become obsolete. But what makes a word obsolete, more than general agreement to forbear it? and how shall it be continued, when it conveys an offensive idea, or recalled again into the mouths of mankind, when it has once by disuse become unfamiliar, and by unfamiliarity unpleasing." Whence Johnson proceeds to the well-known and beautiful closing passage.

Let us pretend that we turn casually the pages of the two grand old volumes and see what is written of words. Correctioner, it chanced, falls beneath the eye. Johnson wrote, "One that has been in a house of correction; a jaybird. This seems to be the meaning in Shakspeare." The word, according to the New English Dictionary, was used but once, by Shakespeare in the second part of Henry IV (v. iv. 23; 1597,) where it was applied to a beadle in a sense somewhat opposite to that in Johnson. Numerous words, rather singular in form and of rarest occurrence, have puzzled lexicographers thus.

Cornet is a most interesting word. It is still with us. It is the kind of word that M. Bréal or M. Darmesteter liked to discuss in connexion with meaning and its ramifications. The Oxford Dictionary records at least 18 senses. Johnson has 5 or so; and it is interesting to see how widely, through sound-association and imagery, the word has been used since 1755. Thus chemists once called certain conical filter papers 'cornets,' and dress-makers had in mind, when they used the word, the cuff of a sleeve shaped like a trumpet; the organist at the console today pulls out an 'echo cornet' or 'solo cornet' stop, and the other musical

image for which the word chiefly stands is well-known. When accordingly Johnson mentioned a disused sense, "A company of troop of horse; perhaps as many as had a cornet belonging to them," he was, though he may not have realized it, really speaking of change and advancement in military science. He more or less recalled to mind armies afoot in the days of Bacon, Hayward, Clarendon. Today, the word is historical rather than wholly obsolete. Possibly the word was not known throughout the eighteenth century.

From a literary and somewhat esthetic viewpoint, the term 'chivalrous' is particularly interesting. Johnson again said, "A word now out of use"—and he was probably right. At least it was not in vogue, it, and many other words of its caste. Today, thanks to Sir Walter Scott and a few others, we can at least appreciate what the word once stood for. Obviously, in its modern or revived use it is not and cannot be the word it was ten or twelve centuries ago.

If we turn to 'fragmentary,' 'to lip,' and 'sans,' we will see yet more of Johnson historically and of the meaning of our subject. Of the first, Johnson wrote, "Composed of fragments. A word not elegant, nor in use." The Oxford Dictionary quotes this comment and adds, "It has been common since 1835." Johnson recalled a verse or two of Donne ("Progress of the Soul:") "What fragmentary rubbish ['rubbidge' —NED] this world is Thou know'st, and that it is not worth a thought." Donne used the word in 1611 and 1631; the next use of it recorded in the Oxford Dictionary is of 1835—more than two centuries later. The dates for 'fragmental' and 'fragmentitious' are 1798 ff. and 1827 ff.; for 'fragment,' 1583, 1611, 1632, 1704, 1716 (Pope,) &c. If it is diffi-

cult to understand this hiatus, it is somewhat less difficult to understand 'to lip' and 'sans.' Is 'to lip' less elegant, less refined, than 'to kiss'? All that one can note is that the use of the former by Shakespeare, Marston, and nineteenth century writers and poets, is not inelegant, unrefined. The chances simply are that 'kiss' was always and always will be vastly more significant, more poignant, than the more doubtful 'to lip.' It is pleasant to think what Addison, Pope, and Thomson might have said about 'lipping,' and it cannot be denied that certain novelists picturing and echoing the youth of today might find in 'to lip' a picturesque and even suggestive synonym. Johnson quoted both of the Shakespeare passages ("Anthony and Cleopatra" and "Othello,") and it is interesting to note that in the former the use of 'lipt' is practically forced by a following 'kissing.' It would probably be an exaggeration to say that the history of 'sans' in the eighteenth century was wrapped up in the history of Shakespeare during that era. Johnson wrote, "Out of use"--and quoted the famous passage which today, unquestionably, largely keeps the word alive for us. The word may today be "archaic" (NED) but ~~has~~ ^{has} a vivid way of turning up now and anon.

'Disloyal' in the somewhat specialized sense of "dishonest, perfidious," was marked obsolete by Johnson, with Shakespeare quoted; but after two centuries and more Mrs. Browning saw fit again to use it. Very characteristically the doctor wrote of 'to drape' in a certain sense from the French: "To jeer, or satyrize. . . It is used in this sense by the innovator Temple, whom nobody has imitated." We shall see presently that there have been numerous innovators "whom nobody has imitated."

Second only to Shakespeare, Spenser plays a large part in Johnson's Dictionary. The poet unquestionably was fond of prefixes; and one might wonder that Johnson found the 'a' in 'abrook' "superabundant"—merely this and nothing more. For he recorded as "Obsolete" a great many such terms: abacke, accoil, accourage, accourt, addeem, adread (Sidney,) agaze, affright (the noun,) aguise, amate, amove, assot; and concerning to awhape the lexicographer wrote: "This word I have met with only in Spenser, nor can I discover whence it is derived, but imagine, that the Teutonick language had anciently wapen, to strike, or some such word, from which weapons, or offensive arms, took their denomination." The famous "derring doe" passage from book two of the "Faerie Queene" is in Johnson, and many others. 'Visnomy' for 'face,' 'countenance,' is "corrupted from physiognomy." Middest is not marked obsolete. Of to prick: "2. To come upon the spur. This seems to be the sense in Spenser." Salliance, Johnson thought, was "A word not inelegant, but out of use;" and he wrote similar comments under slipper ('slippery,' "Perhaps never in use but for poetical convenience,") primal ('first,' "A word not in use, but very commodious for poetry,") promont (for 'promontory,' which abbreviated form he observed "only in Suckling,") and a few others. And so it is possible to enumerate many interesting Spenser words and poetic which in Johnson carry engaging comments: eath and eme and eftsoons, and merciabie and prease and sperse--all more or less "Spenser's words."

There is a particular charm, I think, about the word false. Johnson defined it, "A deceiver; an hypocrite," and said, "Now obsolete." Spenser wrote, "Such end had the kid * * * And such end,

perdie, does all them remain, That of such falsers friendship
 been fain." ("Pastorals.") Such a word may truly be said to
 have a kind of unaffected loveliness in it. Today we know well
 the term 'fakir;' but even it was not chosen for a part in an
 American negro play based on a book portraying the Bible in the
 deep South--"Ol' Man Adam and His Chillun." The word chosen
 in "The Green Pastures" was, naturally enough, not Spenser's word
falsen, nor was it our 'fakir,' but it was their own (i. e., the
 darkies) 'tricker.' Some day a dictionary-maker will mark 'trick-
 er' obsolete, too. The point it is emphatically desirable to make
 here is just the linguistic relationship of Faerie and the Deep
 South.

In the "Faerie Queene" Spenser used the word practick thus:
 "She used hath the practick pain," And "His practick wit, and his
 fair filed tongue;" and Johnson recalled these passages with the
 comment, the word "seems to signify sly, artful." Ensaunter, again,
 is "An obsolete word explained by Spenser himself to mean lest
 that." When one reads such a comment, one regrets that the elfin
 wanderer did not explain more of his terms. Explanations would not
 save him from being the poets' poet,* but they would have saved
 readers all along from making misconceptions. As it is, if we
 are not too bent, as the lexicographer must be, on meanings, we
 can appreciate the whole psychology that is wrapped up in Spenser's
 language. There is everything to indicate Johnson's appreciation.

* "Spenser himself would have regarded as a very crushing
 blow the notion of his being the Poet's Poet: Spenser
 would have chosen 'the Poet's Philosopher'--his 'States-
 man.'"--Professor Harry Morgan Ayres in a lecture at Co-
 lumbia University.

Occasionally, Johnson held, a poet made up his word. Thus Spenser's to leave, "To levy; to raise: a corrupt word, made, I believe, by Spenser, for a rhyme. 'An army strong she leav'd, To war on those which him had of his realm bereav'd.' F. Q. ii." It would be interesting to have Johnson's view of the last word in another more beautiful and equally puzzling couplet (F. Q., ii, xii, lxxv:) "Gather the Rose of love, whilst yet is time, Whilst loving thou mayst loved be with equal crime." To unphilosophize, Johnson held, was "A word made by Pope. 'Our passions, our interests flow in upon us, and unphilosophize us into mere mortals.'"

The lexicographer cited Dean Swift especially for his use of 'quaint.' Swift wrote: "To this we owe those monstrous productions which under the name of trips, spies, amusements, and other conceited appellations, have overrun us, and I wish I could say, those quaint fopperies were wholly absent from graver subjects." Johnson classed the quotation by itself, and defined and commented: "6. Affected; foppish. This is not the true idea of the word, which Swift seems not to have well understood." But the Oxford Dictionary seems to indicate that Swift knew what he was about; or if he did not, Steele, whose Spectator article (No. 450 of 1712, paragraph one) the NED quotes, was just as bad off, and the word quaint is most quaintly deceiving.

It is not always easy to understand the reasoning of Dr. Johnson. Rarely the New English Dictionary shows that his judgment was false. Why 'subduement' is a "word not used, nor worthy to be used," whereas 'subordinate,' though "Not in use," is yet "proper and elegant," is difficult to understand. Of Johnson's

marking 'to jeopard' obsolete, the Oxford Dictionary interestingly has this to say: "No example from 1654 to 19th c. Marked obs. by Johnson 1755. F. Vesey in Decl. Eng. Lang. 1941, censures Johnson for including it, and says 'it is quite out of use', and its attempted revival 'indicates rather a spirit of research than good taste.'" According to which, Scott's reputation ("Nigel," 1922) ought to be at stake. 'Jeopardy,' the NED declares, "was in continuous use during the 18th c."--Johnson to the contrary. 'To sojourn,' again, Johnson felt to be "almost out of use," though he cited Shakespeare twice, and Donne, Exod. xii, 40, Hayward, Milton, and Atterbury. It was probably used throughout the eighteenth century, and is upon the stage of language today. 'Ruination,' with Camden cited (earlier use than that cited in the NED?) the lexicographer called "Obsolete;" yet it is still with us.

Not infrequently, as is truly known, the doctor frowned upon words. He could write brusquely of ingannation (after defining it, as one might say, with considerable windiness, "Cheat; fraud; deception; juggle; delusion; imposture; trick; flight,") "A word neither used nor necessary." 'Twang,' "a word formed from the sound" (&c.,) Johnson held "Little used, and little deserving to be used." Prior (see both Johnson and NED) was apparently fond of the interjection, and the word still does service. 'Twink' is a like use, called obsolete by Johnson, but still more in use to this day than 'twang.' He had the pleasure of pronouncing realitively only a few low and ludicrous words "Obsolete:" to con, to fadge, mighty, mutton ("a sheep,") overlashingly ("a mean word,") to quarry ("to prey upon,") rudesby ("an uncivil turbulent fellow,") to top ("to perform eminently; as, he tops his point,") unsight.

He recognized with regret the aliveness of 'viz' ("A barbarous form of an unnecessary word,") 'shambling,' 'to have rather,' 'wabble,' and scores of others.

The Dictionary of Samuel Johnson is thus an exceedingly human document. When one says that he gave unstintingly of himself in the making of it, one allows that the phrase may be taken in two ways: the dictionary is very much Johnson's dictionary. How far it was typical of its time, how true the great man's judgments seem today, are matters that could never be settled in a few sentences. In our study of obsolescences as such, we close the two old volumes gratefully: no other dictionary in English, at least, has such abundance of personality in it. And the testimonies of a thinking man, in any final analysis of words, are precious and indispensable.

"I have much augmented the vocabulary." Wrestling with verbs "tottering on the brink of utter innuity," perplexedly speculating over etymologies, pointing the beauties of his favorites, condemning the low and ludicrous, warning us lest "words to which we are nearly strangers . . . draw that attention on themselves which they should transmit to things,"^{*} he fulfilled his task.† Though words to him as "the daughters of earth" were not as beautiful, to be sure, as things, "the sons of heaven," he cared enough for English letters "much to augment the vocabulary."

* "Lives of the Poets," "Dryden." World's Classics Series, 1906, vol. i, p. 306.

CH. III

Obsolete words, it was remarked near the beginning of the previous chapter, cannot profitably be inquired into unless they are felt to be abundantly apparent. The obsoletisms of the eras in which we are interested are abundant, and they are noticeably of a literary or learned character. The ways in which the language grows and the vocabulary waxes have been deviously studied, but the subject is still an intriguing one. It will perhaps repay us to recapitulate, briefly, what others have thought and said about these ways,* and then turn to certain interesting figures of the Restoration and Queen Anne periods for their comments, innovations, and usage of words.

Need (or necessity,) experience, leisurely culture (not always felicitous in the result) are notably among the "forces" that activate man speaking. Of the first, the prefaces to letters in the Oxford Dictionary speak with eloquence: those tottering verbs, 'bear,' 'break,' 'come,' 'fall,' 'get,' 'do,' 'lie,' 'set,' 'throw' (&c.,) over which Dr. Johnson made humorously touching complaint (p. 49,) for example. Need, in the thought of one writer (Bib. 344,) rests upon human ignorance or public enlightenment. It came early in the history of our language, and there very possibly was a time when deeds, thoughts, and words were close together (Bib. 351.)

* The following list is suggestive rather than complete, and may be much supplemented by items in Professor Kennedy's bibliography (Bib. 19.) See also the footnote to VI of the Bib. Need: Ayres (343; homogeneity, diversity, energy,) Bell (344,) De Selincourt (351,) Emerson (356; "Brief History," 1925,

Whether it was of a compelling kind or not, it begat words simple in form and colorful and forceful in imagery. The Teutonic character of our tongue is well known. The ocean was much with our distant forefathers, and if they gave it 42 or more names, and if some of the names in our judgment are esthetic in quality rather than purely serviceable, then the need for names must have been urgent indeed! Nature is still compelling in this respect. The sea is still with us, though strange adventures have befallen its terminology (Bib. 425.) The difference between English and American landscapes is not wholly nominal (Bib. 442.)

Experience is, of course, closely related to need. It may be quite real (everyday life, voyaging, physical experimentation,) or distinctly mental (culture, Bib. 379, 397, 414, 424.) In the midst of it, words are often put to new uses, new thoughts. Dr. Johnson's thought is worth quoting: "When the mind is unchained from necessity, it will range after convenience; when it is left at large in the fields of speculation, it will shift opinions" (p. 41.) Others have, of course, expressed this idea. Experience links people, and borrowing takes place (Bib. 380, 413, 556;) it teaches, phonetically and otherwise, the virtue of economy (Bib. 376 and 347.) "Copiousness of Speech" (again in the thought of Johnson) is then likely to come about, and "a sophistication of language" (Dryden's phrase) is complained of.

No single event contributed to the spread of early modern English--of words--so much as the advent of printing in literary

figs. 94, 101, 102--9, 133, 167--3, 172 ff., 173, 195, 199, 209, 215. The writer recalls with pleasure his study under the late Professor Emerson at Western Reserve University in



London. Variety, dialectal and otherwise, is indeed one of the moders of language socially alive; and it is never lost to speech, but merely transmuted. In the fifteenth century, in England's city of cities, a marvellous linguistic metamorphosis took place. It is the work of another place and time (perhaps in the ideal study alluded to early in this dissertation) to detail this metamorphosis: indeed, descriptions of it exist; and the part that printing played in it was large. Tasks must literally have invited, and the semblance of permanence, seeming to reside in the printed letter, may very well have called forth the linguistic best that men—editors, modernizers, authors, translators—could give.

In the midst of a language comfortably and substantially rich, then, in the fifteenth century, presses were set up and the literature of the immediate and remote past, native and from abroad, often underwent transformation. The traveler brought home new words which, except for the printer, would never have gained vogue. Translation was facilitated, accelerated. The reader of Erasmus' life, of Caxton's career, remembers the excitement attaching because of this wonderful invention. But in what way, it may be asked, was pre-fifteenth century English enriched, and how improved and embellished in the modern period, early and later?

the autumn and winter of 1927,) Gordon (361; need and linguistic adventuresomeness—the service of words,) Colton (442; nature and words.) Things: Bell, Marsh (379, paragr. 7,) Whitney (414,) Barfield (424.) Thought and culture: Sapir (397,) Marsh (397, paragr. 5,) Whitney (414,) Barfield (424,) Bray (433--the English critical essay,) others. Experience, adventure: Barfield (424,) Batchelder (425; sea terms,) Colton (442; new scenery in a new world.) Style; conscious enrichment: Emerson (above, fig. 197,) Jones (363,) Krapp (373, "Rise,") Leonard (375; correctness,) Moore (384; important,) others. Generally, books by Marsh (380, paragr. 3,) and McKnight (506, 578,) and Murison (327) and Ayres (343) for CHEL and CHAL.

Respective of the first, the enrichment of middle English, only a kind of caution will be offered. So much has been written, so many statistics have been presented, concerning "borrowing" and "loan-words," that we are apt to think of growth in terms of French words swimming the channel. A much saner view is, I think, presented by Dr. Eleanor Prescott Hammond in her splendid anthology, "English Verse between Chaucer and Surrey" (1927.) The well-known features of the old story of transition are brightly reviewed in Miss Hammond's introduction; but she speaks also of where (in the thought still of Johnson) one would most likely have found words, and of "the many smaller and less obvious factors" making for changes in life and letters alike. "It was . . . not the spectacular arrival of Erasmus in 1497, not the sojourn of Poggio, so much as e. g. the settlement near Winchester of Italian workers in metal plaster" that counted in the life-experience rather than the book-experience of most men. "It was not so much the presence in every great house of foreign secretaries, nor even the necessity for dealing with Flemish wool-buyers and Genoese moneylenders, as it was the extending of every citizen's horizon by enlarged buying power, repeated journeys near home, safer roads, wider acquaintance, aroused curiosity." The canvas is large—too large, it may be objected. But although language and vocabulary are by no means quite the same, in growth they are intimately related; and we must ultimately go for details to historical pictures. Statistics are valuable (Bib. 380, e. g.,) but they are apt to crowd out some more of the truth.

Undenially the later (that is, early modern) growth of the English vocabulary was more literary—in books. How this was so is shown in a book like that of Professor Krapp's (Bib. 373, "The

Rise of English Literary Prose.") Nothing, though we perhaps grow a little weary of the suggestion, so much points particularly to literary growth as the contemporary critical consciousness thereof. Despite Thomas Usk, the understanding of Englishmen must have stretched to some of the privy terms in French; and other critics and writers, not so pro-native or puristic in spirit, sent forth prose-couplings ("animate or gyve courage," "inferiour or base," "adminiculation or aid") and poetic compounds ("hurtlessly.") Ways of looking at the vocabulary thus grew up. Abraham Fraunce might frown on "'woordes quite worn out at the heeles and elbowes long before the nativtie of Geffrey Chaucer,'" but Sidney and Spenser delighted to honor them, and even ^{recommend} ~~transmute~~ them.

Yet this enrichment, though conscious, was of a literary kind. Professor Wyld and others have pointed out how difficult it is to ascertain the spoken speech.* We have really but one means to ascertaining: the historical study of different kinds of strata of speech manifest in books of all classes. Thus a careful consideration of the speech and vocabulary of a character like "Vxor" in early modern English versions of mystery plays (&c.,) or the more pompous style of a "Deus" or "Octavian," shows how varied imitative language could be. If we seek for realism in language and diction, we are most apt to find it indeed in the speech of "Cain's 'Garcio' or Servant, Noah's Wife, the Detractors of the Blessed Virgin, the Shepherds, the Soldiers sent to slay the Holy Innocents, the Pharisees who brought

* "It is an unfortunate circumstance for students of the history of a language, but one from which there is no escape, that they are dependent upon written documents for a knowledge of all but the most recent developments, since, in the nature of things, they can gain no personal access to the spoken language earlier

before Christ the Woman taken in Adultery, the Woman's Lover, the Beadle of Pilate's Court, the Workmen who set up the Cross."*

Prior to the mid-sixteenth century, the clown came into his own. His vocabulary is delightful but limited. [[The semi-literacy rather than the outright illiteracy of characters in plays and novels after 1550 is generally revealed in their half-knowledge of Latin and other learning, their foreignism, their drunkenness, or, rarely, their madness. People who are not sure of themselves are apt to be both ostentatious and loquacious; they truly misappropriate a large vocabulary.]]

than the speech of the oldest living person they may know."
 —H. C. Wyld in the introductory chapter to his "History of Modern Colloquial English" (New York, 1920.)

* A. W. Pollard, "English Miracle Plays," Oxford, 1923, p. xli.

[[The verbal nonsense of a rustic merryman (R. J. E. Tiddy, "The Mummers' Play," Oxford, 1923:) " * * * As I was going across a common the other day I shot an old Jack Hare, hit in the right eye on the left side, took him home to the cook, the cook was n't at home, went to this barn built with apple dumplings and thatched with pancakes, there I saw her upon the wall s inning butter for the cat. I asked her to come down, she said she would not come down, then I said I 'll fetch you down, I scrambled upon my hands and knees and kicked her down about ninety-nine miles under grown on a bed of feathers" (&c.) The devil in the same play became a delightful character, not awesome; Prince George, the Doctor, Oliver Cromwell, Father Christmas--the pompous Myscheff who breaks in upon Mercy's long and edifying speech in "Mankind" (about 1475) --the boy who, after a fashion, knows his Latin in the Digby mystery of Mary Magdalene (part 2, ab. 1480,) and the rustic servant in the Digby mystery concerning St. Paul--impudent Fancy in Skelton's "Magnyfycence" (ed. by R. L. Ramsay, whose introductory note, p. xcix, on the linguistic licence of this denizen of the court is interesting)--Mery-reporte in John Heywood's "Play of the Wether," who assured his good lordshyp that "I am I" (ab. 1520)--Roister Doister and Mathewe Merygreeke and their half-Latin (ab. 1540)--the incomparable Diccon, "too feather-brained [for] .. any useful work" (H. Bradley in Gayley) and many others, might profitably be detailed for their diction.

] E. g., Vxor journeying with her husband in search of safety in

We may, by way of example, look closely at Foreignism in English. It was, in his "Illiads of Homer," George Chapman who made mention of those travelers by whom the mother tongue was being impaired; and the same writer naively demonstrated the assertion in "The Tragedy of Alphonsus" (date uncertain; ed. by Karl Elze, Leip-

time of pestilence illustrates one kind of illittracy, "Why, is Charcole made? I had thought all thynges had been made at London, yet I did neuer see no Charcoles made there: by my trouth, I had thought thei had growen vpon trees, and had not been made. Ciuis [her husband] You are a wise woman; thei are made of woods." (1564.) Costard the clown in "Love's Labor 's Lost" and Launce and Speed in "The Two Gentlemen of Verona" (both ab. 1591) are too famous for quotation (3.1.136 ff. and 3.1.293 ff. resp.) Likewise Basilisco and Piston in "Soliman and Perseda" (1592:) ". . . O extempore, O fbres. . . O harsh, vn-edicate, illiterate peasant, Thou abusest the phrase of the Latine" (&c., 1.3.) Bottom smelling odious flowers in the presence of Thisby; Flute stumbling over Ninny's tomb and having to be helped up by Quince; Cob insisting on Rasher Bacon ("Every Man in His Humor," 1.3, 1596;) Host Blague of the George Inn, serving the good Duke of Norfolke and mouthing Latin—"an illiterate Boore" ("Merry Devil of Edmonton, 1.2.7, 2.1.61, ab. 1598;) Shallow and Slender over Coram and Custalorum; Dogberry instructing the second watch about vagrom men; the Irish host in "Henry V;" and Audrey, who did not know what "poetical" was ("As You Like It," 3.3.17 ff., 1599)—these prior to 1600 are only a few in a long, long line.

A complete census of drunk people in Elizabethan literature would unquestionably startle the puritanical mind. Sly and his host come straight to mind ("Taming of the Shrew," 1.1, 1596,) "Sly. I'll pheese you, in faith. Host. A pair of stocks, you rogue! Sly. Y' are a baggage; the Slys are no rogues. Look in the chronicles; we came in with Richard Conqueror. Therefore paucas pallabris; let the world slide; sessa!" So Sir John, priest of Enfield in "The Merry Dveil of Edmonton" (2.1.36 ff., ab. 1598) and Smug in the same play (later;) Quicksilver, the inebriate of "Eastward Hoe" (2.1, 1605, "Am pum pull eo, pullo! showse, quot the caliver," &c.;) Dampit asking when he last said his prayers, and answering himself (Middleton's "A Trick" 3.4, 1607;) Captain Whit, "Stay, Bristle, here ish a noder brash of drunkards, but very quiet, special drunkards, will pay de five shillings very well" (Jonson, "Bartholomew Fair," 4.3, 1614.) An amazing group, sometimes profane, sometimes amusingly careful of speech ("Now we want none but the company of mine host . . . if he were here, our Constrt were full" [italics mine; "Merry Devil," above,]) pathetically distinguished.

The maniac apparently comes late in English literature. "1st Madman [within] Put 's head i' th' pillory, the bread 's too

zig, 1267.) Realistic foreignism is found in a letter from life of "an illiterate nobleman" early in the sixteenth century (see H. C. Wyld, *supra*, p. 83.) In literature (though not always so realistic) it is found in abundance. The reader will perhaps recall the dainty scene in "Henry V" (3.4) wherein Katharine and Alice prepare themselves for translation into a new life. Paris, truly, has never been far from London. The company in England of French tailors who make you a perfect gentleman (Shirley's "Lady of Pleasure,") of professional men and visitors, of dancing masters and players, is altogether entertaining. Among the first was Deloney's Frenchman in "The Gentle Craft" (1596,) "The fellow, being a Frenchman that had not long been in England, turning about, said, Hea? what you see? Will you speak wed me: Hea? What you haue? tell me, what you haue, Hea?" (1.10.) The quarrel between Dr. Caius and Hugh Evans in "The Merry Wives" (1598) is famous, and the French of it may be compared with that of Delion in William Haughton's "Englishmen" of the same year: "Certes

little. 2nd Madman. Fly, fly, and he catches the swallow.
3rd Madman. Give her more onion, or the devil put a rope about her crag [neck.] Middleton: "Changeling," 1.2, 1623. Again, Dekker, "The Honest Whore," 1.5.2, 1629: "1st Madman. Dost not see, fool? there 's a fresh salmon in 't; if you step one foot further, you 'll be over shoes, for you see I 'm over head and ears in the salt-water: and if you fall into this whirl-pool where I am, you 're drowned: you 're a drowned rat." &c. Sir Giles Overreach in the finale of Philip Massinger's "A New Way" (1633) goes mad, but his speech cannot be said to contain the illiteracy of madness. More pitiful and convincing is the prattle of the Jailor's Daughter in the anonymous play "The Two Noble Kinsmen" (3.5; 1634; also 4.3, "I have forgot it quite; The burden on't, was downe a, downe a, and pend by no worse man, then Giraldo, Amillas Schoolemaster;" &c.) Madness is occasionally feigned, as by Edgar in "Lear" (4.1 and elsewhere,) and by Orgilus in "The Broken Heart" (1.3, 1633) and Roseilli in "Love's Sacrifice" (2.2, 1633, both by Ford: "Can speak; de e e e--" and "Dud--a clap cheek for nown sake, gaffer; hee e e e e" [also 3.2:] in which, frankly, there seems to be the literature rather than the language of madness.

me dincke de mine depeteta de little Angloise, de me Matresse Pisaro is vn nette, vn becues, vn fra, et vn tendra Damosella" (2.1.) Andelocia, to regain his purse and cap, so famous in Dekker's "Old Fortunatus" (1600,) feigns French (5.1;) and Le Frisk, dancing master in James Shirley's "The Ball" (2.3, 1632,) is theatrically typical.

Dutchmen who appear on the boards are Vandalle in Haughton's "Englishmen for my Money," (March, 1598,) Lacy, disguised and singing (Dekker's "Shoemaker's Holiday, 1599, 2.3; also Hans, whom he imitates, 3.1,) Luce in "The London Prodigall" (5.1, 1605,) and another Dekker character, Hans van Belch, in "Northward Hoe," (1607, 2.1—with Doll,) and two nurses, one in Middleton's "Fair Quarrel" (1617, 3.2,) and Lady Frampul disguised in Jonson's "New Inn" (1629, 3.1.) The German characters are fewer; Jerick in Chapman's "Alphonsus" (1574?) and Tearcat in Middleton's "Roaring Girl" (5.1, 1611) speak a "wonderful gibberish which usually does duty for foreign languages" (Professor Saintsbury.)

A delightful bit of language-burlesque in Massinger's "City Madam" (3.3, 1632) is wholly obsolete: "Sir John Frugal. Oh, ha, ene-wak Chrish bully leika. Plenty. Enaula. Sir Maurice Lacy. Har-rico botikia connery." It is doubtful, however, if certain Americans at a famous Tea Party spoke better Indian.

Probably the first Irishman of our early drama was a character in Heywood's "Foure Prentises of London" (1594,) Irish more in sentiment than in language. The anonymous "Life and Death of Captain Stukeley" is quoted by Eduard Eckhardt ("Die Dialakttypen [und] Auslandertypen des alter englischen dramas," Louvain, 1911) for the Irishism of one O'Hanlon, "Zee will take tree prishoners, and give

tee too, and take de turd myself" (v. 337 [Eckhardt.]) Andelocia apparently feigns no Irish speech in Dekker's "Old Fortunatus" (1599) when she disguises as an Irish coatermonger; but Antonio in "The Coxcomb" (Beaumont and Fletcher, 1610) puts on the Irish both outwardly and inwardly—"Now for my language!" English criticism of the Irish has undeniably not always been too kindly,* but the stage still remembers its Patricks (Jonson's "Irish Masque," 1613,) Captain Whit, and Bryan (Dekker, "Honest Whore," 1629,) and many others; and the Irishman may be the last to disappear from the boards.

It would thus be possible to detail other kinds of foreignism in early modern literature: the Italian of Master Bennedicke in Deloney's "Iacke of Newberie" (1596,) Alvaro in Houghton's "Englishmen" (1598;) the Scotch of characters in Robert Greene's "Scottish Hystorie of Iames the fourth, slaine at Flodden" (1598,) or of Jocky in Heywood's "King Edward IV" (2.1;) the Spanish and Swiss—a line or so—in Shakespeare, Chapman, Dekker, Marston, or of Cacefogo in Fletcher's "Rule a Wife" (1640, 1.6.70) and Switzer in Day and Chettle's "Blind Beggar" (1660, "On frolick yonker Dat is de Soryven—Ick Doenitt forstow—De secretarie to Van Here Velieres.") Said one servant to another in Dekker's "Honest Whore," "Ile speake Greeke . . . ere I speake that deadly word ['funeral'] . . . And [said the second servant] Ile speake Welch, which is harder then Greeke." Language, it was elsewhere remarked, [

* The bishop in the anon. play, "Sir John Oldcastle" (1599;) and many quotations and allusions cited by E. Eckhardt in his "Dialekttypen" (&c.,) pp. 43--46.

[First part of "Henry IV," 3.1.240 (given by Eckhardt.)

that a fiddle could speak, "or anything that 's out of all tune." The first Welshman to come before the pit may have been those in Peele's "Edward I" (1590?) but none, for all their names (Hugh ap David, Lluellen, Rice ap Meredith, Owen ap Rice, Morgan Pigot, Gwenthian,) speak Welsh. Will Summer, who appeared about August, 1592, in Nashe's "Summers Last Will," put on the Welsh, "Hur come to Powl (as the Welshman sayes) and hur pay an halfepenny for hur seat, and hur heare the Preacher Talge, and a Talge very well by gis" (&c.) Shakespeare gave us something more authentic in "The Merry Wives" and elsewhere (1598 ff. Shakespeare here may have drawn from life—see F. J. Harries, "Shakespeare and the Welsh," London, 1919, chapt. 1, 8 to 12 inclusive.) It is not always a pleasure to try fathoming the Welshism of later characters—Dauy and Owen in "Oldcastle" (1.1, 1600,) Sir Vaughan ("Satiromastix," 1601,) Sir Owen and Gwenthian ("Patient Grisseelda," 2, 1602,) Captain Jenkin, Doll, others ("Northward Hoe," 2.1, 1605,) Morgan Earl von Anglesey ("The Valliant Welshman," line 51 ff., 1610,) Sir Walter Whorehound and Welshwoman ("A Chaste Maid," 1.1, 1611,) Griffith (Jonson, "Honor of Wales" [masque] 1619: "Taw, d yn ynbyd, y, dhwyti-n alb i anabhy, pob peth oth folineb, ag y tyny gwataar ar dy wlae,") the fourth soldier (Beaumont and Fletcher, "Thierry," 5.1, 1621,) a Welsh madman (Fletcher, "Pilgrim," 4.1, 1621,) Randall (Rowley, "Match at Midnight," 1.1, 1624,) Jenkin (Shirley, "Love Tricks," 3.2, 1624) . . .

What is called "Peddlers' French" and the story of the rogue have carefully and attractively been set forth by F. W. Chandler ("The Literature of Roguery," 1907, especially vol. 1, chapt. 5 and 6.) Literary society has always taken an interest in this kind of speech,

and the names of Beaumont and Fletcher, Chettle and Breton, Thomas Dekker, Chapman, Marston, Robert Greene and Thomas Middleton and Shakespeare, may be especially mentioned. The rogue was a whole society in himself, it seems, who was only distantly related to continental cousins, and about whose language dictionaries and catalogues came to be compiled. Probably the most lively scenes containing cant are in "The Roaring Girl," by Middleton and Dekker (1611,) and "The Fair Quarrel," by Middleton and Rowley (1617.) Moll, Trapdoor, Jake Dapper must have been familiar characters. Speech is for sale in "The Roaring Girl" (4.1.): "[the colonel reading] 'The names of the languages, the Sclavonian, Parthamenian, Barmeoethian, Tyburnian, Wappinganian, or the modern Londonian: any man or woman that is desirous to roar in any of these languages, in a week they shall be perfect if they will take pains . . .'" Autolycus (1611) innovated. Dorindo ("A Mad World," 1603,) Canbee and Hadland ("The Blind-Beggar," 1600,) Chough and Tristram, Jackman (Jonson's "Gipsies Metamorphosed," 1621,) Hircius and Spungius ("The Virgin Martyr," 1622:) none of these were snappers-up of unconsidered trifles. On the critical side, the exuberant and picturesque "Langhorn and Candlelight"—"Of Canting" of Dekker may be instanced.

How much of this speech on the stage and in stories is authentic, realistic? About the best we can do is, with cautious historic imaginativeness, excerpt and compare what seems most valid. One thing is then apparent: an amazing diversity of language and diction. Does this diversity spell enrichment? Opinion will probably be divided. It depends on what one thinks one means by "enrichment." Evidence is at least abundant to show that speech of a popular caste

became copious in the sixteenth century and after. It is possible to show as much for more generally colloquial and technical speech.

There are, to be sure, several ways of showing how the language and the vocabulary with it became copious prior to the eras of our special concern. Scholars have often thought it convenient to separate the native from the foreign element of our vocabulary, and to particularize a process of growth or increase called "composition" in the older period (or Old English.) Words were put together, or affixes were joined to them. O. F. Emerson in his "Brief History" (1925, p. 30) says "the word land was part of at least sixty-three compounds in Old English, while the word even 'evening' was used in twenty-six, and life in twenty-seven, compounds." He further speaks of the rich and flexible word-making in "Beowulf." W. Murison in the "Cambridge History of English Literature" asks (vol. xiv, p. 453,) "And who shall say that English has done wrong in choosing loans like disciple and impenetrable rather than coinages like learning-knight and undrivethroughsome? English seems to feel that a word neednot always consciously define or describe what it stands for. It is sufficient if the word designates." The interesting poetic compounds 'vermeil-tinctured,' 'many-twinkling,' 'passion-winged,' 'sun-forgotten,' and others are presented, and the observation made, "All strata of the language—from slang to poetic prose—possess compounds . . . [including] hybrids"—'aerodrome,' 'kaleidoscope,' 'megalomania,' 'zincograph.' Mr. Murison's lists are richly interesting, and his summary-comments of influences and feelings in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, valuable.

In the modern English period, and especially in the seventeenth century, much borrowing took place. Perhaps no single aspect

of the growth of English has been so elaborately treated of. McKnight recalls, in his "Modern English in the Making" (pp. 270--274,) Melantha and Philotis in Dryden's "Marriage a la Mode:" "O, my Venus! fourteen or fifteen words to serve me a whole day"--'foible,' 'chagrin,' 'grimace,' 'double entendre,' 'coup d'etourdi,' and the like. Elsewhere he speaks of statistics by Jespersen: "Of a thousand English words borrowed from the French, the first hundred listed under each of the first ten letters in the Oxford Dictionary, Jespersen finds only 34 borrowed in the half century, 1650--1700, fewer than in the preceding half century, 1600--1650, where the corresponding number is 69, and much fewer than between 1550 and 1600, where the number is 91, or the period of most active borrowing, 1350--1400, where the number reaches 130." Nevertheless, "The accession of Charles II, who had long lived at the French court, intensified the French influence of his father's reign. This is exemplified especially in the literature of the seventeenth century." And words from Dryden are submitted: 'adroit,' 'aggressor,' 'antechamber,' 'apartment,' 'bagatelle,' 'brunette,' 'burlesque,' 'cadet,' and many more (Emerson, pp. 103--104.) Less direct in their arrival, and less numerous, were Italian and Spanish words in Tudor times and after, and are a kind of index to the musical appreciation, commercial growth, travel, and even science of the day.

In the midst of this accumulation of words, which at length grows bewildering, we must not lean too heavily on separations and classifications into kinds. The separations and classifications are means to an end. The end consists in part in realizing, despite differences (real or only apparent,) how thoroughly a word has been assimilated, what (as the eighteenth century would say) its genius

is, the extent or degree and nature of its obsolescence. In the process of assimilation, as has been often pointed out, a word by no means stays put. It changes phonetically and semasiologically. It perhaps becomes a homophone and acquires many meanings. 'Arm' is an interesting example. We say, thus, that words are anglicized, and are coupled with "native" terms. They are even smashed together.* With Spoonerisms and malapropisms and portmanteologisms now (if not abundantly at least enticingly) at hand, it would be possible to write an "Anthropometamorphosis" of the language (Bib. 55.) Words wholly new in form and idea are rarely created; "the period of invention is now closed."† But new forms are continually being called forth, and it cannot be denied that the thought behind the forms is often newer than the "style" of the word: 'airplane,' 'aircraft,' 'cafeteria,' 'bacteria.' Words must be winged with news.

Hence the caution offered some pages back (p. 53.) The caricature of Dryden in "Marriage à la Mode" is gentle (p. 63.) He thought one thing as a critic of English; he understood so well another as dramatist and playwright! Melantha had her womanly reasons for wishing to introduce 'foible' to the society of her day. But the word, perhaps because of some nuance, was found serviceable. It has been anglicized. Others have not been anglicized, 'coup d'étourdi' e. g., manifestly because of form: neither cognates "at home" nor anything else exist to aid one in gathering meaning from form. French words, in short, were not more borrowed than French ideas were, French things, French gestures and ways of

* Bib. 560 and 567.

† Bib. 373, "Knowledge of English," p. 313—chapt. XX entire.

looking at people and life. Time, place, society have much, of course, to do with the introduction of a word, literary gesture, or manner. 'Chagrin' nicely illustrates this. So does 'cabal.' Neither term will probably ever again be so semantically intense, will probably ever again enjoy such spirited use, as both did circa 1665. But here we anticipate.

Words, it was observed on page 32, are sometimes used apologetically. Nathaniel Ward (Bib. 207) who appears to have signed himself "B," fires whole batteries of peculiar and nonce words at his reader: fédifraction, interpuzzle, verspiellous, pluranimous, preter-pluparenthetical, funambuling, uncasulisty, misobey . . . polypiety, questionful, noddary. As "B," he found it impossible "to hang a padlock on [his] . . . lips, and to cut the throat of [his] Pen;" as "Theodore de la Guard," he continued in the same way of thought, writing upon the religious or church problems of the hour. It is his style, his diction, that interests us. In the "Simple Cowler" (1657) he apologized: "my *modus loquendi* pardoned" (p. 21.) Small wonder when the "*modus loquendi*" was "compolitize such a multi-monstrous maufrey of hereoclytes and quicquid libets."

Others were conscious of their "*modus loquendi*." Thus Boyle, in 1680, in a work on chemistry: "Paracelsus . . . seems to define Mercury by Volatility, or (if I may coyne such a word) Effumability." W. Mountague, 1648: "Gods incarnation inabêlth man for his own decarnation, as I may say, and devesture of carnality." I. Burnet, in his elaborate "Theory of the Earth" (1690) wrote: "Porphyry . . . had the same principles with these eternalists in the text, or, if I may so call them, incorruptarians, and thought the world never had, nor

ever would undergo any change." Fuller in his "Worthies" (ab. 1661) wrote, "The Statute of Additions, was made in the first of King Henry the fifth, to Individuifie (as I may say) and separate persons from those of the same name." An anonymous translator of a work on mathematics, 1734: "Space is nothing else but the mere Power, Capacity, Possibility, or (begging pardon for the Expressions) Interpossibility of Magnitude." "The Ferrifick (if we may be allow'd to frame such a word) or the Iron-making Principle" appeared in a number of the Philosophical Transactions. Grew in his "Museum," 1681, spoke of a "Verdezurine Bole. So I call it, for that it is on the out-side of a blewish-green, like Verdegriese." Baxter in "Infant Baptism" wrote: "as it were to paradigmazize, and stigmatize." William Cowper characteristically in a letter of 1792: "My opportunities of writing are paucified, as perhaps, Dr. Johnson would have dared to say." Much in the way of word-coining has been ventured in letters. The reason is clear. Urquhart in 1652 in his "Jewel" (Bib. 193) wrote: "when an exuberant spirit would to any high . . . conceit adapt a peculiar word of his own coining . . . he is branded with Incivility, if he apologize . . . acknowledging his fault of making use of words never uttered by others or at least by such as were most renowned for eloquence." He "thus may not endanizon new Citizens into the Commonwealth of Languages."

One word often suggests another. Decarnation in the passage from Mountague above illustrates this. Decognize is called a nonce word in the NED, and was used by Burton in his Diary in 1658: he boasted, "There was no recognition to King Charles, and no need of it. . . . I can decognize Charles Stuart and that family, but recognize I cannott." J. Grew in 1711 wrote of "Something which is in-

visible, intastable, and intangible .. existing only in the fancy .. " 'Tastable' has been in the language since 1572 or previously, and apparently no form 'untast[able]' has been desired. A like case is one in Urquhart ("Jewel," 1652,) "Figurative expressions . . . paradoxical, paramogetick, paradiastolary." Each word here is learnedly from the Greek, and one, 'paradoxical,' supplies, as is often said, a real need in the language. It has been much used since 1531. Diastole is a word familiar to those acquainted with anatomy and the heart. The paradiastolary of Sir Thomas, however, is peculiar to him, and is associated with a foreignism, 'paradiastole,' which has rhetorically to do with the setting together of dissimilar things. And 'paromology' (Urquhart's spelling is 'para') likewise belongs to the realm of rhetoric. Alliteration has always played a strong and psychologically interesting part in the history of English writing. But it is only an Urquhart who can turn out such shining parallelisms.

Again, Nathaniel Fairfax in 1674 (Bib. 91) spoke of "Any other word than can . . . cut off all formerness and latterness:" a reasonable invention! Sir Thomas Browne, who could be such a wizard with words, wrote in the "Pseudodoxia Epidemica" (1646, iv, xiii, 231,) "Though we should affirm . . . that heaven were but earth celestified, and earth but heaven terrestri-fied." It is amusing to note that Blount, the lexicographer, recorded terestrify in his dictionary of 1656. J. Chandler in his "Van Helmont" of 1662, stated: "The knowledge of Observation doth not introduce an understanding into the essential thingliness of a thing, but erecteth only a thinkative knowledge." 'Thingliness,' thought not obsolete, according to the Oxford Dictionary, is probably strongly peculiar to Chandler; he else-

where mentioned the "thingliness of a Gas." There is no other recording of the word in the NED. Thingsomeness is marked obsolete; 'thingness' was used by Fraser in 1896, and perhaps previously by a New England philosopher (see the quotation from Greenough and Kittredge in the NED.) But the fact that three such similar forms were used, and were used in the settings in which they were used, proclaims positively the philosophical needs of men for words. The forms are interesting testimonials. Thinkative is altogether alone in Chandler. It apparently has not been used elsewhere. 'Thinking' (though its sense would not quite fit in the above quotation) or 'thoughtful' or 'thinker's' suffice for ordinary purposes.

Interesting, indeed, are casual comments upon words, though rarely passed. "I like not the word Novangles," wrote H. L'Estrange in 1652; "the word Novangles in English is too prostitute and subject . . . to the abuse of the Author's meaning, and to be exchanged and spoken Newfangles." Neither word betrays its meaning—unless one is artful in divining forms, in truth. Our Dictionary defines the italicized term "New Englander," and marks it obsolete rare—one use only. A comment of Dean Swift is possibly familiar: "Those monstrous productions, which under the name of trips, spies, amusements, and other conceited appellations, have over-runeus for some years." This was in his "Letter" of 1712. W. H. Thompson in a history of ancient philosophy, 1856, wrote, "It [egoism] is not more barbarous than its homonym 'egotism,' and much less so than 'egomism,' which occurs in 'Baxter on the Soul,' where it is attributed to certain Cartesians." One might, most certainly, find many such comments.

As a rule, however, a writer is content to explain his unusual word or use of a word, or to couple it with some familiar term. Thus

Shelvocke in his account of 1726 ("Voyage around the World") supplied 'Boatswain' with 'Contre-master.' J. Willock, towards the end of the century, did likewise. John Evelyn, so fond of the world of nature, explained frondation (obs., only use) as "the taking off some of the luxuriant branches and sprays, of . . . Trees . . . a kind of pruning." Meaning and form are especially interesting in the synonymous terms sidefly, forest-fly, and (living) 'horse-fly.' It is perhaps too much to suggest that the latter term has survived purely because of its semasiological suggestiveness. But without question the other two terms do not easily betray their meanings today. The species was once called sidefly from its way of running sideways, like a crab. It will be interesting to look at descriptive names of this kind later (p. 381.)

Sometimes the word is not clearly or very elegantly explained. "Deawarrened, is when a Warren is disawarrened, or broke up and laid in Common." In euripize, the geographical allusion has waned. Sir Thomas Browne in his "Pseudodoxia Epidemica" (1646) wrote: "Aristotle . . . seemes to borrow a Metaphor from Euripus; while . . . he enquireth, why on the upper parts of houses the ayre doth Euripize, that is, is whirled hither and thither." Blount's and others' dictionaries enbalm the word. Euripus, in ancient geography, was the proper name of a channel between Eubœa and the mainland, much celebrated for its violent waters. It is interesting to have and compare such an obsolescence with a famous living expression used a few pages back (p. 39.)*

* Other examples are: cross-like, decanate, decontract, decreation, demission, detenbrate, discumb, disnominate, dispersuasion, dulcorous, elect, engastrollique, essomenic, excarnous, exede, foetant,

It is true that people seldom comment on the words they use. If words in part enable a writer or even a talker to obtain an effect, an unusual or novel or poetic effect, he is satisfied and offers no apology, no explanation. That people, and especially those who write, often take secret delight in their speech or letters, will not be denied; and that this secret delight taken sometimes betrays itself, cannot be denied, either. Still seeking words "where they are used," we turn to some of the old first editions of the Restoration and afterwards.*

If we had no New English Dictionary to work in, some sort of case could be made for the obsolescence of words from the works of writers like Shakespeare, Sidney, Spenser, Bacon, Jonson, like Robert Burton and Sir Thomas Browne, like many of the Restoration dramatists and notably Dryden, like those inimitable diarists Evelyn and Pepys, or paraphrasers and translators, Gayton, Urquhart, Mottaux, or observers of life and time, Waterhouse, Plot, L'Estrange. Turn where we will, if it is words we seek, we are sure to be rewarded. Hosts of readers for the Oxford Dictionary did not capture all of them.* It was because words are endless.

Three words which do not appear in the great Dictionary are

foot-wharf, frump, garabee, garrisonize, gnomonic, gore, grass-girl, hausture, homocousial, hoop-man, incogitate, indelegability, internunce, interpolate, interpolate, intortillage, invision, liberty-boy, laconic, logomacice, natural, nasket, noscible, oblite, olerie, out traders, overlet, overtoise, oxygal, passant, peak, perceptive, pressness, purification, quest-word, supposition, tea-grouter, tempestrian.

* Bib. II. Individual references will not be made. It is a pleasure to recall reading done at the Huntington Library in Southern California, and the courteous interest of Miss Edythe Backus (App. C.)

from plays by Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of Newcastle. To her, "writing [was] as pencilling thoughts . . . So I, to draw my fancies opinions and conceptions upon white Paper, with Pen and Ink, words being the figuring of thoughts . . . writing but the figuring of the figure . . . " She beguiled thus the hours of night. Pepys did not think highly of her dramatic productions; but then she was a duchess. She could afford to have servants abused as wardropians, her amazons inspired as heroickesses; her fair ladies to please fancies opinions might sigh sighs of lament in lifferous winds fanning the sultry heat (Appendix C.)

Let us take certain interesting words to be found in the Dictionary and in well-known plays of the period. A glance will suffice to indicate, at least to the literary student or reader of English history, how much some of these terms are an index to the Restoration. In the plays of Farquhar occur gabber, high-head, paper-moth, charmer (a dance,) occasionaly; in Cibber's writings, dispenseless, dissolveless, sweet-bag; Mrs. Aphra Behn has agreemony, babelard, boremes, betawder, embras, flaber, fuger, gigglish, in-fascinate, plumy (sb.;) Brome, figgle, flocking whe, aldermanical, beggar-niggler. John Crowne in various plays used—or invented—gaytry, gentleboy, beef-eat, chesticore; the more famous William Congreve, pulvil, frisoneer, fulsamic, 'slidikine, chocolate-house, and jut-window; and Ethredge, Davenant, and Wycherley have the words faux-prude, flagolet, gleeker, high mall, Brandenburgh, quebas—grandameship, point-tag-ger (Brome also has this,) sahagun, yieldless—exemplify, i'fads and i'vads, coffee-witt (also in Dryden,) nanger. At the risk of being tedious, I have set down a number of words together which seem to be representative.

Covert-feme, the Oxford Dictionary states, was humorously formed on the analogy of covert-baron, "covered by a husband," said (again humorously) of the position of a married man. The phrase 'covert-baron' is not marked obsolete, but dates imply that it is not now as well known as once it was (1512 ff., 1603 ff.) Dryden, in behalf of a character of his, an old usurer, Gomez, in a play of fast-moving intrigues, seductions, discoveries, and the like, "The Spanish Friar" (1681,) reversed the thought of what may, then, have been a phrase very familiar to "high society"—"I have been robbed, and cuckoled, and ravished, and beaten, in one quarter of an hour; my poor limbs smart, and my poor head aches: ay, do, do, smart limb, ache head, and sprout horns . . . you must needs be married, must yet" and still speaking to himself, he beats his head . . . : "a fine time of day for a man to be bound prentice, when he is past using of his trade; to set up an equipage of noise, when he has most need of quiet; instead of her being under covert-baron [referring to his wife, whom he has just thrust off stage], to be under covert-femme myself . . . " The phrase was thus a perfectly natural thing. It reflects dramatist, character, age. We must not make too much of it. But we take note of its distinctive French flavor, its humor (bitter for Gomez,) its very apt adroitness; and above all, it is still the Dryden writing to whom interesting references have been already made (pp. 27 and 63.) Other interesting terms--presumably obsolete--in Dryden are warlock, instop, wager-hall, duplet.

In chesticore we have, apparently, the corruption of French justaucorps, "a closely fitting garment reaching to the knees, associated with chest." Where John Crowne got the word the Dictionary does not state. He used it, in 1671, in "Juliana," where he re-

ferred to "A rich chesticore with Diamond buttons." Quite a number of like corruptions have disappeared from our language. Fulsamic is an interesting one. The comedies of the incomparable Congreve are too well known for comment, but a line of Lady Froth's, "a great coquette," "pretender to poetry, wit, and learning," may be presented. She and her husband in "The Double Dealer" (1694) are gossiping—the names mentioned are significant: Lady Whifler, Lady Toothless, Mr. Sneer—, and Lady Froth cries, "Oh, filthy Mr. Sneer; he 's a nauseous figure, a most fulsamic fop, fob! . . . " Gaytry is perhaps an altered form (not a corruption) of gaiety, "after poetry, coquetry." It was used by Fuller in 1655, and rather more interestingly by John Crowne in 1635, who linked the word with 'gallantry' ("Gaytry, Gallantry, Delicacy, Nicety, Courtesy.") Figgle likewise is somewhat obscure in origin. The NED makes cross-references to fig, verb³, daggle, draggle, fickle, figge, and defines, "to move briskly and restlessly." Brome used the word uniquely in 1652; he spoke of sheep "figgling and writhing their tales."

Chesticore suggests a whole class of words. While not, for the nonce, interested in their obsolescence, we may put down two or three from the playwrights, in whom their occurrence is often highly interesting: Brandenburgh, a kind of gown, frisoner, woollen stuff? pulvil, a powder or perfume, and charmer, a dance. A gleeker was a player of the game of cards of gleem (now historic or, in a special sense or two, obsolete.)

It may be questioned whether such a word as gigglish is indeed wholly obsolete. It is the kind of word, at least, that one would not be too surprized to find in a writer like Jane Austen or Mrs. Gaskell. Yet only Mrs. Behn, in her "Amorous Prince" of 1671,

appears to have the word; there (4.4) maids are complained of as being "giglish And scornful." Gabber, the verb, is onomatopoeically associated with Dutch jabber, and Farquhar in the "Beaux' Stratagem" (1697) spoke of two characters "gabbering French." Flaber is another such onomatopoeic term, again Mrs. Behn's ("The Lucky Chance," 1687,) associated with the dialectal 'flab,' something thick, broad. "Her flaber chops." Mrs. Behn, indeed, is interesting for her words. In her "Emperor of the Moon" (1687) she has infascinate, apparently a kind of intensive for 'fascinate' ("to draw by fascination"—"That bright Nymph that had infascinated, charm'd and conquer'd the mighty Emperor") and plumy used as a substantive ("I have been at the Chapel and seen so many Beaus, and such a number of Plumeyes"—ladies wearing plumes, feathers.) Like this is George Ethredge's use, in "The Man of Mode" (1676,) of flagolet for "a player on the flagolet." He spoke of a "walking Flajolet." Almost needless to say there is a large ^{number} ~~class~~ of such metaphors.

Flagolet and plumy are at most but gently derisive. One feels that Dean Trench would be happy over the loss to our language of such epithets as beggar-brach and beggar niggler, draw-can-bully, squintifego, tar-barrel, weather-headed, and more to be discussed elsewhere; and that Professor Wyld would welcome news of the loss of oaths like 'slidikins, i'fads and i'vads, adod, efact, jernie (Bib. 518.) Crowne in "Sir Courtly Nice" (1685) gave gentleboy (instead of 'gentleman'—"a young gentleman") a place: "But I would not dress like a Gentleboy, lag at my years among those children, to play with their toys."

We instance four more words before leaving the playwrights. Where "they" spoke of a jut-window (Congreve,) we speak of a 'bay-

window.' Is one "more suggestive of the thing" (Miss Miller and others, Appendix A) than the other? We recall a remark quoted a few pages back (p. 62:) "It is sufficient if the word designates." Congreve likened a woman's eyes to "two jut-windows" in "The Old Bachelor" (1697, 4.8.) The word, especially in this setting, is adequately suggestive of its meaning today; but it is not likely that it was ever much used (NED: "Obs. rare--1.")

Frump is one of those words which, within limits, may mean several things. As a substantive, it meant a sneer, or jeer, or hoax (all obsolete;) in form, it was possibly shortened from frumple (Dutch, 'for,' 'rompelen;' 'frumpy:' cross-tempered, doddy.") In a play by Southerne the verb frump took on the meaning "to be in a bad temper, to sulk." A glance at this word in the New English Dictionary will show that the other meanings are very near to Southerne's. Yet, lexicographically, this use is obsolete. One is again put in mind of Richard Grant White—"there is no obsolescence in literature." Dealing with words, we must sometimes learn to hedge!

How much more true these thoughts are when we come to chocolate-house and the elliptical coffee-wit. Both Dryden and Wycherley have the latter word, though it is Wycherley who explained (in "Love in a Wood," 2.1, where Lydia asking "What is the coffee-wit?" gets the reply:) "He is a . . . gossiping, quibbling wretch, and sets people together by the ears over that sober drink, coffee."

The Restoration would simply not have been the Restoration without these words and, to be sure, many more like them. They are indeed an index to the era. Many are from the French or even frenchified; others are onomatopœically interesting; some betray the effect

of half- or pseudo-learning; a few, at least, served like masks to indicate, often boldly, the social spirit--sometimes most unhappy, leering, ugly. The playwrights knew well the subtle uses of words. Beyond clothes, scenic effects, and even gestures, the consummate dramatist looked to possibilities in speech. Mikhnamant's first appearance in Congreve's "Way of the World" must have been a fine dramatic touch, and fashionable; but it is not complete without her lover's self-revelation (2.5:) "Here she comes, Bifaith, full sail, with her fan spread and streamers out, and a shoal of fools for tenders—Ha, no, I cry her mercy."

John Evelyn and Samuel Pepys, notably among diary and letter writers, and travelers, seem to have had an ear for words and a way with them that is often matchless. Diamonds taken from their settings do not lose lustre, but these "mere words" of England's two charming men of letters, when taken from their contexts, often do. Yet Evelyn's gelotосcopy is something of a gem—when you know its meaning—, and there are a few others which it is worth our while to look at. In such words as gardenage, garden-sin, orangist, sandish, frondation, petagere, and counter-espalier, we see readily where we are. We shall not attempt here the psychology of gardeners and gardening which some of these words imply. It is pleasant to recall woodcuts and the like of the circumspect gardens of the period—and after. The Englishman has always, like "Henry Ryecroft," had a true love for his garden, occasionally not unattended by a "complacent sense of superiority which is the foible of most gardeners."[[

* Divination by means of a person's laughter (Bailey, 1730.)

[["Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit.," vol. 8, p. 336.

In the "Kalendarium Hortense" (gardener's almanac) Evelyn wrote: "Neglecting it till [the weeds] are ready to sew themselves, you do but stir and prepare for a more numerous crop of these Garden-sins." Frondation, in "Sylva" (1664) he defined as "the taking off some of the luxuriant brances and sprays, of such Trees . . . a kind of pruning:" a coinage from late Latin. Evidently the term potagere, a kitchen or herb garden, was well-known; Evelyn has it in his "Diary" in 1669 and thirty years after in "Aceria." A counter-espallier (in the "French Gardiner," 1658) Evelyn explained as being "a hedge which forms all the walkes and allies of the garden." The term was incorporated in Bailey. Sandish, "somewhat sandy," has been lost to us; 'sandy' is sufficient. Evelyn has the word at least twice, and it appears not to have been used elsewhere. The comment is perhaps worth venturing (though the obsolescence of the word is not yet our immediate concern) that such a word would phonetically not have much chance against 'sandy.'

Perhaps the most interesting word is orangist. We know the word today, but in an entirely different connexion. Evelyn defined it, in his dictionary of 1693, "a Gard'ner that cultivates Oranges, or any person that understands and delights in the Culture of them." Word and definition alike may be allowed to have a casual reasonableness about them. But Time has seemed to say that we have no use, no need for such a term with such a meaning. Today, the words 'Orangist' and 'Orangeman' have historical significance (1800 ff. and 1790 ff.) It is quite reasonable that Evelyn's word should not be known in England today. Oranges are not grown in England. But they are imported; and it is interesting that the word 'oranger' (1776 ff.) should refer not to a man but to a sailing-vessel. French has—or did

have—the word orangiste (La Quintinie, 1690.) It cannot be denied that there is something naive about this word, and that today, if it would not look a little ludicrous, certainly 'banann-ist' would, or 'loganberryist.'

Evelyn was, indeed, a most unusual coiner and user of words. Orangist, from the dates in the NED (1693 and 1690, above,) was possibly procured from the French; but fuelist ("one who supplies fuel," in "Sylva," 1664, "First that our Fuelist begin with the Underwood") looks like an original creation. And so several wholly rare terms, not always from the French, may be had in the volumes of this traveler, gardener, antiquary, anecdoter, and even authority on ladies' dressing-rooms: euro-boreal, frigidiferous, enorder, posary, nociferous, over-sob, and ceduous. Such words seem indeed to fit in with the timely display of vanity in "Mundus Muliebris," the array of marginalia in "Numismata," the aphorisms neatly nooked in "Sylva." The reader will find, in Appendix C, an especially characteristic word of Evelyn's, chartophylatium. Though composed sometime prior to 1704, the Memoirs for his grandson were not made known until recently—1926. "Next the library," wrote Evelyn, "should be carefully inspected the Chartophylatium of your pamphlets and unbound Books and loose papers, wick [sic] would require an accurate Visitation and to be put in proper Method." The word would not be unuseful today; and it is the kind of word that makes literature delightful reading. A little further on he wrote: "Where I spake of Armor I do not omit those old and obsolete pieces formerly in use, Muskets, Culivers, Back, Brests, and potts, shields, and Targets, Curasses, Poll-axes, Basket-hilt swords, &c., which should now and then be clens'd and

furbish'd, no furniture more becoming a Gentleman's Hall." John Evelyn (especially the Evelyn of the "Travels" in Italy--"if you will believe it") was often cautious concerning facts. But he was a free-trader in words: not so much a free-trader, it might be added, that his vocabulary lacks true distinction and validity.

The "Diary" of his friend Samuel Pepys is likewise often distinguished in its diction. "A curious curiositiy it is to discover objects in a dark room with," he wrote concerning a new invention, the scotoscope. The telescope, the microscope, the scotoscope, and the burning glass were, according to another piece of intelligence of c. 1670, all being perfected at this time. Pepys likewise has angelique, betwit, breedling, nursery (a theater for training young people.) In such forms does the vitality of a man's language often lie. Pepys's interest in music is well known. The dates of spinet and espinette are interesting. The date for the French word (in the NED) is 1522; and Pepys was at least one of the earliest users or borrowers of the word in England: he spoke of an espineth in 1664 (July 1,) but he had the pleasure of owning an espinette four years later (15 July 1663.) The former term has, in musical circles, endured to this day, and is, like 'piano-forte,' an exceptionally interesting word. The word 'grapnel,' in the idiom of Dr. Johnson, he "appeared not well to have understood," although it is to be confessed that of late (1875 ff.) the word has been loosely used. It originally designated a small anchor (1556) for use on boats and balloons, or sets of iron claws for securing the enemies' ship (1573;) but Pepys had in mind what we call a 'harpoon.' The word 'harpoon' was apparently not specialized (as we say) until the end of the seventeenth century (1694, first

date.) Earlier, it was of vaguer meaning (Purchas, 1625, Dampier, 1697; barbed dart, spear, lance.) Pepys, in 1663 (6 May,) spoke of catching whales in Greenland "with iron grapnells." Conjectures as to his use of 'grapnel' or non-acquaintance with 'harpoon' are hardly worth making; but it is worth remarking that when our knowledge is of distant things, strange things may happen to our language.

Did Pepys write gracy (obsolete) or 'lazy' in his "Diary" on Easter Sunday, 1661? The writing runs, "In the morning towards my father's, and by the way heard Mr. Jacomb, at Ludgate, upon these words, 'Christ loved you and therefore let us love one another,' and made a gracy [or 'lazy'] sermon, like a Presbyterian." That is all about the sermon; the passage continuing has other matters. Editions differ. Wheatley (1893) has 'lazy,' without note or comment; earlier editions, 'gracy'—whence the word is in the NED. If the reading should be gracy, it would be interesting to know how the diarist meant the word to be taken, whether neutrally (as suggested in the Oxford Dictionary, "full of teaching about grace, evangelical,") or not. 'Evangelical' had for quite some time (since 1531) been in the language. But Pepys certainly did not have this word in mind. "Like a Presbyterian."

Edward Waterhouse, as one interested in arms and armory, presented some interesting terms: famillice, inconfident, altess, athletary, prefulgency, pseudomillites (italicized,) and others. This was in 1660. Unquestionably the writer's style reflects a spirit steeped in depression and Christian humility. The book begins with the complaint that men are led more by opinion than by reason, more by sensuality than by judgment. It discusses the many

aspects of arms—their rise and descent (the Romans, antiquity,) their "Use and Behoof," their analogy and proportion, and, elaborately, their names, &c. "Tis true," wrote Waterhouse in one place (p. 116,) "Souldiers have the start of Scholars in their Eagled strength by the confidence of which they soar high, making, as they think, their nest above Controll, but their Eggs may be sucked by industrious Ants, and their Enterprises may become adde through the diligent and accute vigilancies of those pen and inkhorne men, which some Pseudomilites and reputed Martialists do villifie." There is indeed a fulsomeness of expression in Waterhouse—especially for one so depressed! Moods have something to do with words.

Seven years after Waterhouse witnessed and recorded the London fire. The Huntington, formerly the Bridgewater, Library copy, a little withered old volume of 190 pages, once belonged to the author, and has his signature.* The style of the man becomes unduly stilted—at least if one wishes to be style-conscious: "so men may see the dreadful effects of providence, untutelar to their acquisitions, and call off their hearts and confidences, from these sublunaries, to God," "vicissitudinarious," "fautive," "Balsamitiqueness," "ruling of Wine into Vinegar, and of Oyl into Aqua Fortis, (as I may say.)" But the matter is often interesting. The fire is first philosophizzd, then described, from the start in Pudding Lane, "little pittyful Lane," to the end, four days later. There is a closing prayer for recovery, and the words, "God knows my heart, I hate the vapour of words divorced from real and solid intentions" (pp. 144—145.) Despite this declaration, Waterhouse

*

here composed such terms as establishable, eventriqueness, exin-
fluence, imponderate, boisture, restancy, vastative, sutter, pre-
limination. Eventriqueness may be taken as an example—"f. as if
 eventric. L e and ventr-us, belly," "corpulence." The NED marks
 it, almost needless to say, "Obs. rare⁻¹" "If London . . must
 be born with till its humors be sweetened, and its eventriqueness be
 reduced . . then to no purpose is this waste or rage." Again,
 "These repulsives shall be exinfluenced, ..their vigour . . be abated."

Antiquarians are rarely more thoroughgoing and interesting
 than Robert Plot, whose observations respecting people, climate,
 agriculture, industrial pursuits, geology, and antiquarian matters
 generally, led him to write two charming companion volumes on
 Oxfordshire and Staffordshire (1677 and 1686.) His discussion of
 British coins, of astronomy (the Zeland telescope, p. 217,) of
 sulphur and gunpowder, and especially of waterworks (illustrated)*
 deserve particular mention. The Index reveals that Plot was, as
 the antiquary often loves to be, the "Believe-it-or-not" man of
 his day. For he gleaned accounts of strange births, of an egg with
 another in it, of a clock moved by air, of Pnigitis, or black chalk, of
 finless fishes. The drawings for his books, like the descriptions,
 are full of pleasant minutiae. Names do not always accompany these
 drawings, else we should have more obsolete names for obsolete ob-

* Pp. 233 ff., the folding doors or flood-gates, "sluces," &c.; "the
 whole fabrick of a Turn-pike." Sir Philip Harcourt's fish pond;
 and Wilkin's raising, "of but few gallons of water forced through
 a narrow fissure . . a mist in his Garden"—and with this mist
 between observer and sun, a rainbow. Sir Anthony Copes' water
 works, artificial falls with a candle in the midst thereof "not
 overwhelmed . . ." Thomas Bushell's wonderful natural water-
 work-house, their performance for royalty—the echo-performance
 and hermit rising out of the midst.

jects. Thus there is a nameless invention of Sir Richard Astley of Pateskull, for matching the length of game-cocks—unless 'collistrigium' or 'pillory' be allowed. The account of the iron works in Staffordshire is particularly interesting (IV, p. 163.) Words that engage our attention, accordingly, are: electrine, emuscation, gallish (excrecence produced on trees,) glum-metal (local name for stone, not unlike lime in behavior,) apifactory ('apiary,' 1654, Evelyn, Mem.,) blanketer, mocket-head, tropaean, rhomboideal. One is tempted, in turning the pages of Plot, to think of his world as, after all, a microcosm.

It is in the pages of Roger L'Estrange that that interesting word pundigrion had, it seems, its earliest appearance. A full note is given in the NED at the bottom of page 1594, wherein 'pun' is put alongside 'cit,' 'mob,' 'nob,' 'snob,' all coming into fashionable slang at or after the Restoration. Punnet is apparently a diminutive of 'pun,' which may be an abbreviation of Ital. 'puntiglio;' and pundigrion may be an illiterate or humorous perversion of the same Italian word. The word allonge in L'Estrange is notably isolated. It is from the French; "He leapt a step backward, and with great agility, alonging withal." Thus the verb. The substantive, early obsolete in our language, was recently re-adopted as a foreignism (1862,) and has a technical meaning now: a slip gunned to a bill, &c. Allongation, 1665, is likewise "Obs. rare⁻¹" Today we have 'elongation.' The isolative element seems to be the prefix. Sacramenting is marked "nonce" by the NED. The term enormitan of Hamon L'Estrange is worth marking. What meaning does it reasonably yield? L'Estrange seems to have used it in the sense "one who exceeds ordinary bonds, who behaves extravagantly." He likewise has imperi-

osity, loan-recusant, and superedify; his novangle has already been cited (p. 68.)

So interesting is the "case" of Joseph Glanvill, that some space and a liberty will be taken to clarify the matter of his English. It is, of course, the same Glanvill who was spoken of a number of pages back (p. 11.) In an essay on Preaching, 1678, he took Nathaniel Fairfax to task for such word-inventions as all-placeness, all-timeness, thorow-fareness. Fairfax, according to Glanvill, was shunning the Latinisms 'immensity,' 'eternity,' 'penetrability.' "This English," wrote Glanvill, "is far more unintelligible than that Latin which custom of speech hath made easie and familiar. . . . These are the hard words I condemn, and this is a vanity I think extremely reprehensible in a Preacher." And the critic continues in this vein.

Criticism and date are both very interesting. Many years before the English of Glanvill had undergone chastening. Mr. R. F. Jones in an article published in America (Bib. 368) presents engaging parallels from the pages of the 1661 "Vanity of Dogmatizing" and the 1664 "Scepsis Scientifica" (really a second edition of the "Vanity")—parallels, that is, full of stylistic contrast. In those intervening years Glanvill became an ardent supporter of the Royal Society, and testified in his 1664 preface thus: "'For I must confess that way of writing to be less agreeable to my present relish and Genius; which is more gratified with manly sense, flowing in a natural and unaffected Eloquence, than in the musick and curiosity of fine Metaphors and dancing periods'" (quoted from Jones' article, p. 990.) I take the liberty of presenting from Mr. Jones' pages two brief specimens.—

"For body cannot act on anything but by motion; motion cannot be received but by quantitative dimensions; the soul is a stranger to such gross substantiality, and hath nothing of quantity, but what it is cloathed with by our deceived phancies; and therefore how can we conceive under a passive subjection to material impressions. Vanity, p. 29

"For Body cannot act on anything, but by Motion; Motion cannot be received but by Matter, the Soul is altogether immaterial; and therefore, how shall we appreciate it to be subject to such Impressions Essays, p. 6.

"If we will take the literal evidence of our Eyes; the Aethereal Goal moves no more than this Inferior cloud doth. Vanity, p. 78."

"To Sense the Sun stands still also; and no Eye can perceive its Actual motion. Essays, p. 20."

Upon which Mr. Jones comments: "In these passages there is an obvious change from 'specious tropes' and 'vicious abundance of phrase' to 'a primitive purity and shortness,' in which 'positive expressions' and 'native easiness' are manifest. . . . Here, indeed, is merciless pruning."

Aside from style, VII, pp. 62 ff., of the "Vanity" may be cited for its thoughts—the 'admixture,' as Glanvill pictured it, of falsehood and truth, and the perception of all things "by proportion to our Selves." Glanvill's organization is always orderly, and his comments, where not afire with ornate diction, sometimes sententious. Nevertheless, his earlier work does abound in words like admixture, infedundous, transiliency; heat is, elaborately, the "Orb of the activity of fire," the "fountain calefacient:" if motive energy must be called 'heat,' let it be so: "To impose names is part of the Peoples Charter, and I fight not with Words. Only I would not that the Idea of our Passions should be apply'd to any thing without us, when it hath its subject no where but in our selves."

Long after, in "Seducismue Triumphatus" (1681,) Glanvill's

attention was upon witches and related matters, and it cannot but be noticed that he here returns to the invention or use of odd terms. In view of the literary metamorphosis of circa 1664, it can only be said that the words drollist and droller, confamiliar, illapsable, nullibism, fatuosity, imperscrutable? were perhaps meant in a measure to "astartle" (Glanvill's own word—and More's) the reader in a book on a startling subject. Books on witches then abounded ("Camb. Hist. of Eng. Lit." vol. 7, pp. 395--396, bibliography.) It is always to be remembered, finally, that writers (translators excepted) do not usually work with dictionaries: at least, dictionaries are not their founts. In the seventeenth century it was rather the other way around.

Edward Waterhouse, mentioned a few pages back, was not of course the only one to write on arms. The subject is one of the most interesting in this study of words. A book deserving praiseworthy mention was a certain work of three life times: the Randall Holmes's " . . . Armoury." The dates, most interestingly, are 1688 and 1905. The 1905 volume explains the authorship of this encyclopedia of heraldry and completes the printing of all that the three Randall Holmes gathered. Arms and heraldic designs, too, are the symbols of things; and it was not always easy to connect subject matter and symbol—tackle, machinery, ordering of ships, setting of sails, games, music, parts of man's body . . . a museum to wander in! But to the student of speech, volume 1, part II, 414/2 is most engaging. Here words are discussed, homophones distinguished, equivocal defined: and again we have our old friends 'grave' and 'bill' (see pp. 25 and 23, and Bib. 264) with us: for equivocal "are words of several significations, which renders them doubtful and obscure:

as, Malus, which signifies both an Apple Tree, and Evil, and a Mast of a Ship: so Populus, signifies a Poplar Tree, and the People, with many more in the Latin: so in the English, a Bill signifies a Weapon, and a Birds Beak, and a Written Scrawl: Grave, signifies Sober, Ancient, and Sepulcher, and to Carve on Wattle."

While it is left to the bibliography (item 126) to show what an array of obsoletisms, especially such as name things, lie dormant in these pages, two or three may be presented here. In view of orangist above (p. 77,) Holme's fructster, a "Fruit-seller . . . Fructerist or Fruterer," takes on interest. Fruitester was probably Chaucer's exclusive term (1396, the "Pardoner's Tale.") Our terms are 'fruiteresse' (dating from about 1713, Steele in the "Guardian") and 'fruiterer' (1408,) besides the compounds 'fruit-woman,' 'fruit-seller,' 'fruit-vender,' &c. It is possible that in the word globe-dial we have lost an object rather than a name of a familiar object. While the New English Dictionary defines, "a sun-dial," Holme specifies, "A Ball or Globe Dial, to shew the Hour without a Gnomon." 'Sun-dial' has been with us since at least 1599, and the object, longer. It was, before the end of the sixteenth century, termed "simply dial" (NED.) Goglet (sb.²) was a drinking cup of horn—"goglet, goblet." Jollop (as a verb) is uniquely in Holme, "to gobble;" the noun (first use, 1705) is derived from 'jowl' and 'lop.'

Any detailed study of the enrichment of our vocabulary would have much to do with travelers. Most of the terms introduced by travelers, however, have remained. It is only occasionally that one finds obsoletisms like caphar, lantern-leaves, snow-hammer, woff-fly, or covid, lavadero, rubb, surpoose. Professor John Livingston

Lowes in "The Road to Xanadu" has named many of the valuable and delightful travel books of our period. But only occasionally, it seems, do they have words that have come and gone. Dampier thus speaks of burton-wood, a shrub found in the Galapagos islands and elsewhere. He speaks of a bloom (sb.,³) associated with 'blow,'—"I have always observed the Sea-winds to be warmer than Land-winds; unless it be when a bloom, as we call it, or hot blast blow from thence." He anglicizes 'curtana,' which, since c. 1259, designated the broad, pointless sword, emblem of mercy, borne before kings on their coronation days: curtan. Dampier used the word twice. Elsewhere he has land-fast, negrine, saddling.

Likewise the writings of travelers like Sir John Chardin, Jean Dumont, George Shelvocke, and Lionel Wafer, only occasionally have words not now known. The very handsome copy of Chardin's book "For the Queens most excellent Majesty by H. M. most humble a most obedient servant . . ." in the Huntington Library is full of charming engravings—mosques, Tauris, monastery-like churches on the wastes of Persia, Tefflis (fair city.) Chardin occasionally attempted to etymologize city-names; but of Hamzah: "a proper name it is, whether it signifies something or nothing." His account is richly of fevers, of fights avoided, of the meanings of religious paintings, of the place where Noah's ark rested. But neither here nor elsewhere, in other writings by other travelers, do many obsolete words appear.

One of the most amazing books read for this study was John Bulwer's "Anthropometamorphosis." A fairly detailed account is given in the bibliography (item 55.) Bulwer's marginalia show how steeped he was in the Bible and in such authors as Ovid, Grimstone, Purchas, Bacon, Sandys, Lindscholt, Montaigne, De Bry, Cicero,

Lithgrowes ("Travels,") Oswaldus, Johan Bohem, Herbert. These books were Bulwer's ships to sail in, and he delighted in their rich cargo. He arranged his material into numerous scenes (rather than chapters,) and showed thereby how pathetically and ignorantly man has, as he said, "new-moulded" all parts of his body in different parts of the world—the head, the hair, the face, the eyebrow (shaped into triangle, cut away, cut square across, &c., &c.,) the eyelid, the eye itself, the nose, the ear, the cheeks—mouth, teeth, tongue, lips ("lipp-gallantry,") and so forth. He comes at length to "Tailed Nations, or Breech-gallantry" (one of his few interesting words.) But though his matter is deeply engaging, he has only here and there a rare or obsolete term: feminile, gargolette (rare only, small earthen vessel,) labeon (one who has large lips; picked up by the lexicographer Phillips afterwards.) Skin-prints, however, is exceptional. The words 'tattooing,' 'tattoo' (verb and substantive,) and the like, were not to be known for more than a century later. Cook was to introduce them from the Polynesian in 1769: "Both sexes paint their Bodys, Tattow, as it is called in their Language." Bulwer's linguistic resourcefulness is interesting.

Gilbert Burnet's book, "The Theory of the Earth," may be briefly mentioned here. It is interesting not for its obsolete words but its obsolete subject-matter. The bishop's figures for repeopling the earth after the Flood are most amazing. Science and travel have indeed altered matters!

And so, travelers' words have by and large proven permanent additions to the vocabulary. Nevertheless, words no longer known, "brought back" by those who journey, are often arresting. Caphar, given above, is much the traveler's word. Maundrell, 1703,

has it twice: "A place where we paid our first Caphar;" again, "The excessive demand made upon us by the Caphar-men"—a toll duty, a premium for defence. Similarly chawbuck. "He has a Black Guard that by a Chawbuck, a great Whip, extorts Confession:" so Fryer in an account (1698) of East India; and nabobs, muskets, and chaubacs and chawbucks are mentioned in the eighteenth century (1756, 1784.) Covid is Anglo-Indian: a lineal measure of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Lavadero is a much-cited foreignism in translations from the Spanish; and quadrel, specifically, "a kind of brick used in Italy," is mentioned by Plot, Leoni, and others. Fryer likewise speaks of tree-stones, precious in variety, having tree-like markings. Occasionally, the report was of something not alone distant but difficult to believe in. Curiosities are everywhere, and are extant today. Perhaps, having recently seen at the cinema what Evelyn describes, we can believe our traveler when he records: "The water spouter, who drinking only fountaine water, rendred out of his mouth in severall glasses all sorts of wine and sweet waters," &c. The water-spouter of 1656 is named by A. C. Hutchison: "Black de Manfre, who died in 1651 . . . and who is styled the 'water-spouter.'" (1816.) Tempestrians will be detailed, with other exceptional words, in a later chapter.

Lavadero, above, "a place for washing ore," occurs in translations of foreign books of travel. While translations will be looked at presently, a few terms from translation and travel may be presented. Procuraty, anglicized from the Italian ('procuratia;') designated in Du Mont (1696) the official residence of a procurator in Venice. Rubb (foreignism) from the Piedmontese and Arabic, occurs in a translation of Keyser's "Travels" (1756)—"Many

peasants in Piedmont sell annually four or five Rubbs of raw silk." A rub weighed twenty-five pounds. There is another foreignism, rub (sb.,¹) from the German and Dutch, designating a seal (c. 1000,) or sea dog (1598,) and occurring in Marten's "Voyages" (1694.) Snow-hammer translates or serves for German 'schneeammer' in an English rendering of Pallas's "Travels" (1802:) "During the whole of our journey . . . we were accompanied by small flights of snow-hammers." We speak of 'snow-finches.' Tambouret, generally "? Obs. rare" in the NED, is in its second sense in the Dictionary, engaging: "The tambouret [orig. tamburetto], which is a less seat, granted usually by Queenes to Princesses of great quality" (1653, tr. of "Hist. . . . Swedland.") Zumbador was the name of a South American humming-bird (1760, J. Adams' tr. of "Juan and Ulloa's Voyage.") Finally, the "French Book of Rates" (lantern-leaves, 1714, "thin sheets of horn for lanterns") may be mentioned as a fruitful source of words of this kind.

We turn, by way of contrast, to two novels, some of whose obsoletisms are remarkable. The first is a tedious romancy by Lord Orrery, or Roger Boyle: "Parthenissa" (1654.) The writer could indulge in such passages as (in behalf of his heroine:) "If, by a loss of the greatest part of your blood, you have discover'd that which was an offence, you have discover'd that which is partly the reparation; since what acquainted me with the fault, acquainted me with the punishment of it; and if I have now any resentments, they will sooner be satisfied by your preserving, than by your shedding that which is left." In the way of words: disinvitation, inaccessional, lently, amplificator. Nathaniel Ingelo, in his long "Bentivolio and Urania," 1660 ff., sought joy other than that

which is in laughter—sought, indeed, intellectual joy in creating names like 'Plutopenes' (the poor rich man, never making good use of his wealth,) 'Theoprepia' (state worthy of God,) the rough deserts of 'Pammachia' (full of strife,) 'Hermagathus' (good mercury,) 'Forzario' (violent temper,) 'Morosophus' (half-wit,) besides 'Piagenza,' 'Vanasembla,' 'Bentivolio' (man of wisdom, goodness, courage,) and 'Urania' (light.) These words are not in the Oxford Dictionary, but inconquerable, indiscerning, indisturbed, and a few others are (all obsolete.) There is considerable fancy in the book. One is reminded—distantly—of Sidney. Hedonia "seem'd to have woven the Rainbow into a loose Robe, which being so rarified that she might be seen through it, and also spatter'd with radiant Jewells, in the forms of Stars, one might well say that she was an Embellish'd Cloud" (pp. 80--81.) The student of speech is delighted with the company of illiterates desiring to argue over the word 'kiskildrivium' (volume 1, p. 166—) "being much taken with the wonderful sound of the word." In the quarrel that ensues, they go off to Logomachia:* "After this they quarrell'd a good while one with another about the choice of some Question to dispute of; but coming to no agreement, they resolv'd to dispute of nothing, and so went away all together to Logomachia."

Mention was made, on p. 86, of witches. We return to the subject just long enough to recall two unusual books by John Gaule, "Select Cases," 1646, and "The Magastromancer," 1652. The latter we shall have cause to cite again (p. 345.) Both books are not less noteworthy for their light on the times and the subject than for their

* Not in the NED. 'Logomach,' 1865, '-ial,' 1830, '-ist,' 1825, &c.

app.c.

methodicalness and astonishing word-lists. These will be found in the bibliography (item 103) and on page . With the magastromancer's "sun" shrowded from him, the author, "in some kind of twilight," ignites his own candle to expose the awful tribe. "First, [no one] . . . ought to stumble at the new coynd name I have prefixt; since the thing itself is so old" He will pose or poze the Magastromancer in an ancient, just, sound, and direct way, for he does not wish to "flourish in a wild circuit of words, but [come] close to the matter at hand." Some twenty-seven chapters lighten the subject from various points of inquiry: from the truth of faith, from the temptings of curiosity, from the testimony of authority, from the vanity of science, from the prestigiousness of experiment, from the poorness of supposition, from the consciousness of caveats, from the fatuity of fate. As we turn page after page (367 of them,) we are amazed at the author's boundless obligation to words, and wonder that one who wrote so untiringly of "Amulets, præfiscinals, phylacteris, niceteries, ligatures, suspensions, charmes," could talk of avoiding "wild circuits of words!"

The writings of Henry More are so celebrated as to need but brief comment respecting their diction.* Nothing, finally, so clear-

* Up to 1912, More's philosophy rather than his language seems chiefly to have been studied. See the bibliography in the "Camb. Hist." (vol. 3, p. 456) and A. G. Kennedy's index to subjects (1922--1927.) J. Bass Mullinger in his brief treatment (CHEL 8.279 ff.) emphasizes the reading of Spenser (the "Faerie Queene,") the perfection in Greek and Latin at Eton, his passing knowledge of Milton at Cambridge, the admiration of his pupils, his retirement to Ragley. The contrast of More's language with that of a man like Bunyan (CHEL 7.171) is perhaps worth noting. A. B. Grossart in his Memorial-introduction (1873, p. xxxii) excellently brings together various comments of More's own: "For I must confesse such was the present haste and heat that I was then hurried in (dispatching them in fewer moneths

ly explains More's choice of words as More's poetry. If one reads this poetry, especially the famed "Song of the Soul" (1642,) with no eye to the Dictionary (or gleanings of unusual and obsolete terms,) one is impressed by the casualness and infrequency of rare words.—

" . . . as when the flitting fire
That Natures mighty Magick down did call
Into the pyly wood, at its own fall
Grows full of wrath and rage, and gins to fume
And roars and strives 'gainst its disquietall . . ." [1.2.21]

"—Call out some wondrous might, that listless staves
In slower phansies. Bid 't break all delays;
Surround with solid dark opacity
The utmost beams that Phoebus light displays
Softly steal on with equall distancy
Till they have close clapt up all his explendency." [2.3.2.14]

It is elsewhere (see footnote below) that More criticizes his own words. His reading was rich, his leisure ideal; and the Latinisms at length came in cataracts. More did not seek to stop them, though he sang a lament,

"How ill alas! with widdome it accords
To sell my living sense for livelesse words.

[But] rather then my inward meaning wrong
Or my full-shining notion trimly skant,
I 'll conjure up old words out of their grave, [flict," 38-9]
Or call fresh forrein force in if need crave." ["Cupid's Con-

More was, as he states specifically in three or four places, careless as to words. Lists are submitted in the bibliography.

then some cold-pated-Gentlemen have conceited me to have spent years about them, and letting them slip from me so suddenly while I was immerse in the inward sense and representation of things, that it was even necessary to forget the oeconomie of words, and leave them behind me afloat . . . (like chaff and straws on the surface of the water . . ." (Epist. to Rdr. "Philosophical Poems" of 1647.) Again, "Careless how outward words do from me flow" ("Cupid's Conflict.") Growsart makes interesting comparison with Spenser in the "Shepherd's Calendar," and adds: "Many of the new words and new 'ideas' were as hieroglyphs rather than expressions of his thoughts" (&c.) See also R. Ward's "Life."

A much more odd writer is Edward Benlowes in his "Theophila," a poem of great length describing the ascent of Divine Love through Humility, Zeal, and Contemplation. It is not diction alone that makes this book so unusual, nor expressions like "kill[ed] into life," but an array of strange drawings. Benlowes has many terms like angelity, angelence, embribble, enchariot, enlabyrinth, entinsel, entheasm (which word Heywood also used in 1635—"inspired by an indwelling God,") epicyole (the verb,) fucod ("beautified with fucus, painted,") fulgurance ("dazzling brilliance, as of lightning.") The list given will readily suggest how serviceable affixes are, and how they cause words to multiply; words from Edmund Gayton, below (and Bib. 104) may be compared.

More interesting than lists of endless obsolete Latinisms from the ever-beguiling pages of Sir Thomas Browne would be a study of the fortunes of some few exceptional words of his—words and uses of words of which he was particularly fond (abrupt as a verb, e. g.,) or words peculiar to him but used or recorded by other writers and by lexicographers (benegro, boation, celestify [Blount,] emication (emicate in Tomlinson, Motteux, Blackmore,) exesion [Bonet,] fritiniancy ("twittering"—of the cicada and the locusts: Blount,) guttulous [Biggs, "form of small drops,"] iliacal [J. Taylor,] numerally [Baxter,] operable [Gale,] pollinctor [Evelyn,] and many others.) Just what, for example, is the surviving form in the language of the adjective of 'cotton' (so to speak) to be, and why? While it is not possible here to dispose of that "why," we shall pause over Browne's cottonary, a fair example of word-forms (affixes) adjusting themselves. Browne spoke, in his "Hydriotaphia" (1658,) of "cottonary and wooly pillows." It appears to be the only

use of the word. John Evelyn used both 'cottony' (living) and his own (as time has proved) cottonous (obsolete,) both in "Sylva." The first is on page 28 of the 1679 edition, where he speaks of oaks "full of cottony matter;" the second, on page 251 of a much later edition (1776,) where he speaks of "a thick cottonous substance." Cottoned, ppl. adj., is obsolete: 1488 to 1599. 'Cotton' itself attributively or as an adjective is "most alive" today, the commonest form, and has been in use since 1552 or thereabouts. And thus once again the fulsomeness of English is demonstrated, and perhaps there is no better way of disposing of a "why" than through demonstration, alone. Undeniably, Sir Thomas is linguistically most interesting. Whence, exactly, he had his Latinisms, the NED sometimes shows. One seeking to demonstrate and analyze the Latin in English would do well to turn the pages of his books. Did the source of his information about snails in the "Pseudodoxia Epidemica" (1646) dictate or seem to dictate "soft and exosseous"? was Browne conscious of the term 'boneless' (ca. 1000 to the present) in or in contrast to his own exosseous? or was it a deliberate kind of natural choice—is Sir Thomas Browne just very much, always, in his words?

Browne is not ^{only} always close to Latinisms and the Latin in English words, but has one brief and interesting comment on them. There are, perhaps, other comments in his writings; but his criticism of 'grasshopper,' 'cicida,' and 'locusta' in the "Pseudodoxia" (sect. V, "Pictures," III, "Grasshoppers,") is concrete. He believed the term 'grasshopper' improper, a defect in learning; "for having not the insect with us, we have not fallen upon its proper name, and so make use of a terme common unto it and the Locust, whereas other countries have proper expressions for it; so the Italian calls it

cicada, the Spaniard cigarra, and the French cigale; all which appellations conforme unto the originall, and properly express this animall." If we understand in 'grasshopper' what the Latins thought of when they said 'cicada,' we "may with safety affirme the Picture is widely mistaken, and that . . . there is no such insect in England, which how paradoxically soever, upon a strict enquiry, will prove undeniably truth." The antiquary then explains the parallelism of French 'santerelle' to English 'grasshopper' from imagery. Our grasshopper has teeth; the cicada has not, and feeds on trees.

While our study is by no means exclusively of literary words, we turn in conclusion here to men of letters, poets, and translators. The array is amazing, and we must leave it to an appendix (E) to accommodate most of the offerings in the NED. We look first to critic and essayist.

An invaluable little book by Mr. J. W. Bray has already been mentioned (pp. 5 and 7, and Bib. 433.) With the Oxford Dictionary now at hand, it would be possible to supplement, perhaps greatly, and augment the information in this interesting study of the critic's words. Mr. Bray himself champions the notion of importation of terms, and allows that "in the history of criticism the meaning of . . . terms employed has shown a decided change from the indefinite to the definite." He instances 'romantic' (a much-discussed word: see Nyrop, App. A, and L. P. Smith, Bib. 541) in the periods 1750—1800 ("general spirit of romance adventure; wild picturesque scenery and imagery,") 1800—1830 (philosophical antithesis of 'romantic' and 'classic,') and the period 1850 ff. (wherein it acquired a second "enemy"—'realistic,' and came to designate two periods in the history of English literature, Shakespeare's and Wordsworth's.) Other com-

ments will be found in the bibliography.

At the time of Mr. Bray's writing (1898,) some 1500 terms constituted the vocabulary of criticism, and perhaps three-fourths were of a psychological nature—esthetic terms, terms in appreciative and impressionistic writings, evoking the reader's judgment of themselves. There is, of course (Mr. Bray adds elsewhere,) no such thing as a purely esthetic term. And the value of any term in criticism is fairly well established by asking, How definite is this term?

The critical vocabulary has been immensely increased and enriched by writers like Coleridge.* Hazlitt also, for his 'gusto,' especially in any literary or linguistic phase it might be found to have, and Lamb, and others, might be named. Professor Irving Babbitt in a number of the New York Nation for 1912 had in mind the matter rather than the manner of gusto-criticism of the nineteenth criticism, of course; but his remarks might be set in nice contrast to those of a critic like Professor George Saintsbury on the words a critic may choose ("History of Criticism," vol. 3, p. 297:) "We could abandon Owen Felltham to him with more equanimity if he did not describe, as 'vile English, or properly no English,' such words as 'nested,' 'parallel' as a verb, and 'uncurtain,' all excellent English of the best brand and vintage, formed on the strictest and most idiomatic patents of analogy. There is still far too much criticastry and pedanticulism (here's for them!) of this kind about, and men like Hallam are very mainly responsible for it. Even 'obnubliate,' to which he also objects, is a perfectly good word, on

* Up to 1922, according to A. G. Kennedy, there were only two

all-fours with 'compensate,' which he himself uses in the same context, though less usual. A sovereign of just weight, fineness, and stamp is none the worse for having been a little circulated: nor is a word."*

Probably the books and balm-boxes of criticism since the end of the last century would be found to have many such sovereigns. Many of them are with us, and with us to stay. The answer to the question, Upon what does the life of a critical term depend? implies a little psychology of critics, criticism, and words in criticism. One supposes that the life of a term important to English criticism would depend on something beyond usefulness. Elsewhere the apparent fondness of Samuel Johnson for 'encomiastick' (as he spelled it) has been mentioned. The word as used several times in "The Lives of the Poets" is more than just useful. Mostly such terms of criticism have remained. It would be interesting to detail, beyond what is offered in the New English Dictionary, the word 'gusto.' Hazlitt, who attained a mood by rich and sonorous aisles of words, has surely more to say about gusto than what he said in connexion with Michael Angelo (the only NED quotation.) The word is a foreignism, and has, according to the Oxford Dictionary, three living meanings and two obsolete. It may still mean "individual liking, relish, fondness," or "zest" (George Eliot's "Tory joke performed with much gusto,") or (in Art)

articles on S. T. C.'s English, neither having to do with his critical vocabulary (Lane Cooper, numb. 7232, and Tietje, 7233.) Cf. Professor Raymond Alden in his preface to his "Critical Essays of the Early Nineteenth Century," pp. xvi ff., and Miss Laura Johnson Wylie in her "Evolution of English Criticism," Ginn, 1894, pp. 162 ff., on S. T. C.'s power of "looking at things from within." Alden emphasizes the spread of the new attitude.

* I have my friend Mr. William Mould to thank for this reference.

"Artistic style" (so Sterne 1766, Lamb 1822, Hazlitt 1824;) it is obsolete in the senses "Aesthetic appreciation or precept" (obs. rare, 1663, and 1711 Shaftesbury Charac III 111 (1737) II 430, "Another, who has no Gusto of either sort, believes all those they call Virtuosi to be half-distracted,") and "Flavour or savour (of food.)" With Hazlitt, gusto was "a slowly accumulated criteria of judgment, taste." With Godwin, Hartley and others, the word was used otherwise; and a third meaning in the eighteenth century was "enthusiasm;" cf. Horace: "physical taste." It is a great word, and the NED perchance has not done justice to it.

The word 'supercilious' has lent itself nicely to criticism. The image of an eyebrow has long been lost to this word. Yet there was possibly some sort of imagery in the language of Johnson and his Boswell. In an "Idler" paper of 1758 the doctor wrote: "Hopeless as the claim of vulgar characters may appear to the supercilious and severe;" and Boswell of Johnson's pamphlet: it "was fortunate enough to obtain the approbation even of the supercilious Warburton himself." But the word in this sense ("dictatorial, arbitrary, despotic, overbearing" [Johnson;] "exactng or severe in judgment, censorious" [NED]) is peculiar to "them"—is now obsolete.

Two words, both of rarest occurrence, pressness and rapturist, have a kind of critical feeling in Young and Madam D'Arblay. Young in 1728 spoke of "Boileau's closeness, or, as he calls it, pressness;" and Miss Burney in her Diary (1783) put the responsibility on another: "Warton . . . is what Dr. Johnson calls a rapturist."*

* THE mention of Mme. D'Arblay's Diary suggests the large number of terms, often witty and nonce, that might be had from the letter-writers. It is interesting to note, however, that editors

We shall content ourselves with but a few others here, not all obsolete, and not especially from critical writings.— Thus Dean Swift's Kolist, used by the dean for "a pretender to inspiration or spiritual regeneration" in the famous "Tale of a Tub" (1704.) It is not easy to see why Tucker's be-blunderbus (1765, "He so be-block-headed and be-blunderbust me about as was enough to hurry anybody") should be "obsolete," and 'be-blockhead' and 'beshiver' ("shiver to atoms," 1648, Herrick's cloud "Beshiver'd into seeds of raine") not. 'Blunderbuss' was long before Tucker's time of writing in firmly established use (1654 or earlier.) Dextralize is more obviously obsolete (1651, Biggs,) and endearedness (1654--1714, used several times) not so much so. Slightly varying forms like exquisitiveness (obs.) and 'exquisiteness' (living, 1599 ff.) are to be had in abundance; but these two examples are mentioned here because in Stafne's form (obs.) may lurk some slight but desired nuance or feeling. Anything in the way of words is likely to occur, of course, in a book

of the NED do not always mark them obsolete (Bib. II, 2.) This is especially true of nonce words and forms, for which letters seem to be a favorable habitat. Thus Horace Walpole has 'aubergical' ("Some tender swain had written . . . his fair one's name in this usual aubergical exclamation,") 'caligulism,' 'chancelloress,' 'youthfullity.' Mrs. Delaney (besides the obsolescences in the bibliography [217]) has 'circumfloribus,' 'bishopeess,' 'scramblement;' Southey, 'dukely,' 'chaise' (as a verb,) 'peripateticate;' Malmesbury, 'harmoniac;' Lamb, 'catarrh' (vb.,) 'diseasement,' 'yearning;' Keats, 'stumbleblock' (1819, in letter to Haydon, 3d of Oct., the reviewers were one day unable to stumble-block him,) 'whipship' (humorously for 'coachman' in letter to Fanny Keats.) And so many others (see Appendix E) might be cited: 'postly,' 'vanitarianism,' 'electiveness,' 'egoistry' (interesting to compare with words submitted on p. 68.) Berkeley in a letter spoke of 'castle-hunters'—"We have not the transports of your castle-hunters: but our lives are calm and serene." So 'fopple' as a verb (obs. rare,) and 'fog-race,' a jocular burlesquing of 'progress' (also obs.) Vulgar forms like lotium for 'lotion' are rare.

Mme. D'Arblay and Dr. Burney could exchange pretty words and

like "Tristram Shandy" (see Bib. 186 and references there; also 'drollish,' 'iracundulous,' 'scientinotically,' and 'Waterlandish.') Imagery may impel the use of a word; Smith in his voyage of 1749 spoke of a sea "feathered with a strong Tide." Although there has been much use since at least Bacon's time and Puttenham's of the word 'encomium,' the verbs from it, encomiate and encomionize, are interestingly obsolete. One feels that an encomium itself might almost be written of these words, so classic is the feeling in them and so rich the use of them. The two verbal forms are—or were—of rarest occurrence, 1651 (Biggs,) and 1599 (Nashe) and 1647 (R. Baron,) respectively. One is, to be sure, most of all put in mind of Erasmus.

The words from Sterne above inevitably suggest how fond men of letters of all times have been of jocular and playful forms, often marked "nonce" by the lexicographer. They are scattered through all kinds of literature, or writing. It would be a very great task, and perhaps of no especial value, to try to bring all of them together: unless, indeed, one wished to make a psychology of linguistic humor, literary fun, or to determine the full meaning and character of that interesting term "nonce." Because it is here that the vocabulary is so much concerned for its increase if not enrichment (enrichment always depending on one's feeling and viewpoint concerning English,) we shall pause and focus our attention momentarily on the nonce-term.

meanings. We may take the word grubbery by way of example. Many terms like it may be found. But we take it because, unless one can supply more than a memory of things in Mad. D'Arblay, those feasts of letters, the discovery of the word in the NED has no particular value for one, no efficacy. "And so," wrote Dr. Burney to Miss Burney, 8th Oct. 1791, "prepare your departure on Thursday: we shall expect you here to dinner by

Under the word 'nonce' itself in the Oxford Dictionary (4, attrib.) is found the statement, ". . . the term used in this Dictionary to describe a word which is apparently used only for the nonce;" and a cross-reference to volume 1, page xx ("General Explanations") leads one to a similar remark, "Words apparently employed only for the nonce are . . . marked nonce-words." The history of the phrase is well known, and the NED characteristically demonstrates the now long and useful life of the expression. But definitions do not always take us far, and it would be profitable, in a needed study of this kind of word, to ask what makes a word a nonce-word? where does consciousness of the "nonceness" of a nonce-word lie—chiefly with coiner or user, with reader, or in the eye of critic and lexicographer? may a nonce-term be used indeed only "for the once," or oftener? and, finally, who are the writers who make or use the most nonce-expressions, and where are they most plentifully found? In attempting a partial answer to two or three of these questions, we shall perhaps make a little clearer still how the vocabulary grows. We shall essay the second question first.

The lexicographer is not always sure of his nonce-word or form. Thus the Oxford Dictionary marks as doubtfully nonce quite a number of terms, like a-christism ("disbelief in Christ," 1726 M.

four.—The great grubbery will be in nice order for you, as well as the little; both have lately had many accessions of new books. The ink is good, good pens in plenty, and the most pleasant and smooth paper in the world!" (from the 1842 publication.) The Oxford Dictionary quotation, perhaps needless to say, is not as long as the above quotation, and therefore does not make clear, or at least amply clear, the situation, the picture, the probable fondness of the Burneys for this word. Only imagination, finally, can supply picture and full significance.

Briefest mention may also be made of 'daintification,' 'dismal' (D'Arblay,) 'prophecize' (Mrs. Delany,) Hunt, Lamb, Southey, Walpole, Coleridge, and others above, in their letters.

Henry, "But what do you think of such a thing as a-Christism?") altify ("to exalt," 1662 Fuller Worthies,) annary ("a history or record of the events of each year," *ib.*;) *op.* 'annals,' "narratives of events written year by year," 1563 *ff.*,) betawder ("to bedizen with tawdry finery," *a.* 1639 Mrs. Behn City-Heiress 2.2 "Trick and betawder yourself up, like a right City-Lady, rich but ill-fashioned,") botch ("to mark with botches," 1699 . . . "Young Hylas, botch'd with Stains too foul to name,") equestriana (1825,) land-berg (after 'ice-berg,' 1853, "mountain of ice, glacier,") and leopardize (1762.) Further, it may be wondered why words like 'awaredom' (Walpole in letter, 1752,) 'bakerdom' (1833 Pall Mall Gazette,) 'disquire' (1654 Gayton, see below,) distutor (1691, Wood,) disvalise (1672, Marvell,) emblustricate (whimsically from the equally fantastic French 'emburelucoquer,' *a.* 1693 Urquhart Rabelais "The Romish Church, when tottering and emblustricated with the Gibble Gabble Gibberish of this odious Error,") foppotee (1663,) fickle-dom (*a.* 1754 Richardson Correspondence,) 'flavouriferous' (neither nonce nor obsolete, *a.* 1774 Fergusson,) sagoize ("to put on a regimen of sago as a diet," 1847 Tait's Magazine,) scientissimous ("very learned," 1650,) 'subtrist' (rare, 1820 Scott Abbot "You look subtrist and melancholic:" *i. e.*, "somewhat sad,") vulpeculated ("robbed by a fox," 1671, "Widow Wamford . . . vulpeculated of her brood goose,") and 'rinkomania' ("passion for rink-skating," 1876 World and Tinsley's Magazines) are not marked nonce. But it must be remembered that the Oxford Dictionary was not edited by one and the same man.

On the other hand, a nonce-word is usually unmistakable, and a certain feeling concerning it often exists from the moment of

its creation or first use,* because of its very character, or because of its situation among other words. Surely Sir Richard Steele in a number (1713, No. 29) of the Guardian knew what he was about when he ranged "the several kinds of laughers under the following heads: The Dimplers, The Smilers, The Laughers, The Grinners, The Horse-Laughers." This is a way of saying that your user—or creator—of nonce-words may indeed be "nonce-conscious." And so ought his reader.

Nonce-words are of all periods, but perhaps a detailed study of them would show them to be especially plentiful since 1800, and in writers like Carlyle, [[Coleridge,]] Southey, & Hunt, Lamb, Walpole and in many magazines—but notably Blackwood's, Fraser's, the Pall Mall Gazette, the Saturday Review, and Tait's.) One would not wish, in

* Bib. 364. While one may not always care for the spirit of Mr. Hall's comments (he is sometimes severe towards those he cites, both critics and writers,) it cannot be denied that he offers a wealth of information about the first uses of words and nonce-words. We need not take too seriously the comment, "Nothing can be more hazardous than to pronounce that a given word has never before been used." Words have a way of being reborn into the language.

[Bibb 534. The following terms may be added: dapperism, defenceful, diswhip, (diswig,) frothery, inconsequentism, laughee, legatess, observist, provokee, scratchable, worksome, worldkin. The fondness of Carlyle for diminutives, for '-ism' (&c.,) and sound in words—onomotopæic words—is pronounced. His only rivals are "S. T. C." and Urquhart in his translation of Rabelais and perhaps Southey and Sterne.

] Bib. 240, App. C ('adagy,' 'paramouncy,' 'quippish,' 'transcriptural.') Unquestionably the marginalia of S. T. C. alone would yield many nonce-words like 'disensoul' and 'fancyette;' elsewhere: dastardling, deathify, dyslogy, exforcipate, impossibilification, leggerly, poppean, proflated, sterilifidanism.

((Bib. 183 and 364. A few may be added: chaise (v.), demonifuge, diabolocracy, henatrice, humblefication, propheciographer, shavee, stelliscript. L. Hunt: avadice, delphinity, electiveness, staf-fian, sticked. Richardson: doggess, handsomeish, pray-prap. App. E.

) Alphabetically: All Yr. Rd., belaborious; Acad., stagship; Ath. Brit

making such a statement, to exclude from memory Urquhart, Motteux, Sterne, Mrs. Centlivre, Beckford, and many others. It would be interesting to range their nonce-creations in groups, to see how well the words answer to the writers: Mrs. Centlivre's timely nonce-use of 'Low-boy,' Evelyn's engotish, Steele's beauetry, in jocular imitation of 'coquetry' in the "Tatler" (1709.)*

What, then, makes a word a nonce-word? Nonce-terms are above all things full of surprises. They seem to delight in attracting attention to themselves, although Dr. Johnson (p. 49) and others[[] have insisted that this is a shade sinful of words. We may characterize

helpship; Atl. Mo., deteriorism; Blackwood's, despotomania, destinee, detonsure, disidentify, eleeson, exaspirate, expectoratory, fancyette (S.T.C.), fidimplicitary (also in Urquhart—"Jewel,") glenikin, glenlet, gravocracy, profundify, slaveage, others; Brit. Quart., ego-hood (cf. p. 68;) Chamb., dollatry; Contemp. Rev., divitism, statuomania, withness; Cornh., egglet; Daily News, (elephantship,) (fightist,) flingee; Dubl. Rev., fideist; Edinb. Rev., energist, stonelet; Examiner, fillism, whisperhood;; Fishing, elverhood; Harper's, expertize; Illustr. London News, elephanticide; Lond. Rev., ecclesiastioize; Lond. Gaz., coloness; Murray's, diariness, shamedly; Macm. evacuationist; New Mo. Mag., decapillatory, digitate, eccentricize, sonnetomania, flabberdegasky v.; Nation, desperadoism; Pall Mall Gaz., detoxicate, director (v.) drivee, hangee, hand-woman, propheto-crazy; Quart. Rev., eelhood, grandiloquacity; Scrib., Englishly; Shilling, describable; Society, disodour; Sporting, preachee; Scarletite ("one who hunts in scarlet," used in 1829 and marked obsolete by NED;) Sprt. Pub. Jrnls. depeditate; Sat. Rev., demagoguize, expelee, expertism, fandango ('faunship,' used by Hawthorne, is not called nonce;) Tait's, demonagerie, dictioneer, embastelle (v.,) pluckable; Temple Bar, Bathotic, hibernophobe; Times, declarationist; Westm. Gaz., ghostess. This list is exceedingly incomplete, but is perhaps representative.

* No. 29, para. 2, "the man . . . affected with Beauetry" (dandyism.) The nonce-words of Urquhart and Motteux, chiefly from Rabelais, are all but endless (see Bib. 193 and 154;) Sterne has 'drollish,' 'iracundulous,' 'scientinctically,' and 'Waterlandish' (something like an emergency-word) in "Tristram Shandy;" Mrs. Centlivre has 'flirtship' and 'Low-boy;' Beckford, 'fandango' (v., "to dance the fandango;") and other mentions will be found in Appendix E.

[Notably Bacon and Locke (p. 30;) cf. Ogden and Richards ChML (Bib.(391)

the nonce-term, briefly, as being sometimes superficial in its analogy,* occasionally imitative,[[often picturesque,]] and very frequently possessing an exceptional sort of suffix.((When one says "exceptional sort of suffix," one is thinking of a word like 'emotionate,' where

* Thus 'bathotic,' "fr. Gr. on superficial analogy; cf. chaos, chaotic." 'Bathetic' (which it "means") is also irregularly from 'bathos' on the analogy of 'pathetic' (NED.) Others: ennealogue (after 'decatalogue,') presultory (cf. 'desultory,') pyrrurgian ('chirurgian,') &c.

[[So 'chit-chit-chat,' 'cheho' (echoic,) fadoodle, flabberdegasky (cp. today's 'flaggergast,') prattle-box; see p.

]] Especially diminutives, 'worldkin,' 'fountainlet,' 'glenikin,' 'glenlet,' 'houselet,' 'stonelet,' and the like. The Greek 'logos' is in several English nonce-words: notably 'logopandocie,' 'logofascinated' (both, it is interesting to note, in Urquhart's "Jewel," 1652,) 'logomacice' ("word-fighting"—Saltmarsh 1646,) and 'lognomy' ("science of language," 1803.) Other like terms are not marked nonce: 'logolatry,' used by Coleridge in 1810 ("Literary Remains") and subsequently in the nineteenth century (last date 1890,) 'logomach' in the Cornhill Magazine for 1865, and 'logomachic' in the Westminster Review in 1830; Coleridge also used 'logomachist' (1815, again in Pall Mall Gazette in 1882,) and 'logomachize' was in Fraser's, 1830; 'logomachy,' 'logomania' (foreignism,) and (p. 92) 'logomachia.'

'Waterscape' (App. E) is not pictured for us in the book-of-travels-quotation in the NED, but is a word to conjure with in this day of submarines sinking treacherously. The nonce-words 'dogfully,' 'dogling,' 'dogology,' and 'dollaratry' are picturesque, and the emphasis is as much on meaning as form in 'demonagerie,' 'demonette,' 'demonifuge' and 'devilade,' 'diablelist,' 'diabolifuge,' 'diabologue,' 'diabolocracy,' if not also in 'demagoguize,' 'demoniculture,' 'diabolically,' 'diabolized,' 'diabolepsy,' &c. Where we find 'coughery' in the language (a. 1693 Urquhart Rab.) we expect to find 'spittery'—and are not disappointed (Urquhart again, same ed.,) though 'spittery' is not nonce. Interestingly, there was apparently no term, 'spittoon,' until 1840. Which facts possibly intimate that the editing of the Oxford Dictionary is somewhat uneven. 'Dogdom' is "humorous" (1854, 1892, Chamb. Jnl., and Pall Mall Gaz..) 'dogship' was used by Mrs. Behn in 1679 and by Ruskin in 1860 (neither nonce nor obsolete,) and 'doglet' is not in the NED.

((Feminine distinctions are interesting here: (-ess,) bishopess, botcheress, chancellouress, coloness, fauness, ghostess, legatess, scouress, siress, witeess; (-ette,) citizette, demonette, (fancy-ette, treasonette—nonce, but diminutive rather than feminine;) squirina, hang-woman, henchwoman. -ism: Caligulism, dapperism,

one would expect 'emotional' (1324 and 1357 respectively,) or like 'ghostess' or 'hangee,' in which lurk two kinds of humor, or like 'gardenist' or whimseycado (obsolete.) Horace Walpole used, sometime between 1762 and 1771, the word 'gardenist' in a book on printing, and in a letter to Horace Mann (1769,) 'gardenhood.' Whimseycado, like numerous others,* shows the effect of, not so much (as is often supposed, loosely,) the pseudo-learned, as the humorously and consciously illiterate. Gayton used it in his Notes concerning Don Quixote, 1654, "If Amadis du Gaul and Palmerion Be lies, what whimsey-cados are we in?" The words 'devil' ('diaθ') and 'dog,' for only two examples, have, figuratively speaking, little tribes of words about them, now (see footnote to preceding page;) and a nonce-term like

desperadoism, expertism, fillism, pedalism (and many others;)
 -ist: declinist, energist, evacuationist, fideist, (fightist,) gardenist (see above,) 'gardener' is the usual term, of long standing, 1300 ff.,) observist, effronterist, pronounist (obs.) Most of the words in '-ist,' as will be shown in a later chapter (Ch. VI,) are, where obsolete, rare in use, often unneeded, and occasionally irregular in derivation or awkward phonetically.

Abstract words in -ship: enemyship, (feunship,) flirtship, friarship, invincibleship, snowmanship, bellyship, dunship; in -hood: ego-hood, eelhood, elverhood, (elfhood,) (fishhood,) wormhood, whisperhood (and many others in both these categories;) deathify, decipherage, infantocracy, diabolocracy, dollolatry, dogology, sinnography; rapster; sonnettomania, statuomania, despotomania; dullery, emroidery (place where ...,) frothery, demonagerie, leggery, pushery, coughery, (spittery,) spectrey, whifflery; patrondom, scribbledom, stættlerdom, shackledom; bumperize, chapelize.

Diminutives: (see -ette above,) egglet, fountainlet, glenlet, houselet, shaftlet, shaglet, stonelet; essaykin, (essaylet,) glenikin, worldkin; drippliekie; dastardling, fearling, flirtling, stumpling, yearnling, balladling, dustling (obs.)

A great many negative forms like 'deblind,' 'decrott,' 'de-doctor,' 'deparochiate,' 'discommonwealth,' 'disuniversity' might be given; 'dismal,' 'diamond,' 'fandango,' 'shallop,' 'stumble-block,' 'Alexander' and others all as verbs make exceptionally interesting study (add 'cæsura.')

* 'Circumfloribus,' 'humblefication,' 'impossibilification,' 'prosal-comi-epic,' 'sterilifidianism,' 'enixibility,' 'monstracious,' 'occide,' 'preterpluparenthetical,' 'sape,' others.

diabologue (obs., in an autobiography of a. 1713, "These dialogues, shall I call them, or rather diaboliques") is sure to make its mark. True, the word is "obsolete" in the sense that it is "no longer in use." We must always guard against the fallacious notion that words, especially words used intimately in diaries and letters, are "candidates for admission into the language." "There is no obsolescence in literature." Rarely, an allusion lurks in a nonce-word just as it sometimes does in words of commoner use; so Urquhart in "Jewel" uses, mindful of Horace, 'quomodocunquize;' and rarely a nonce-word is of foreign parentage directly: so the burlesque term of Motteux from his *Rabelais*, 'sape,' "to be wise," in 1694—"If then you sape, as we are cogitating"—"Et si tu es (comme cogitons) sage." The two words are in vivid contrast, and it may be thought that we are well-rid of words like 'quomodocunquize,' that help "to stretch the capacity of the tongue."* Such, in part, is the character of nonce-words.

Does the poet have a vocabulary of his own? Regardless of what is said about it, the opinions of teachers, critics, and readers will simply always differ.¶ One thing, from about an even hundred obsoletisms in the poetry of our period, seems evident: that it would

categories is nonce-words in -ee: cursee, dislocatee, drivee, expellee, flingee, hangee, laughsee, patronsee, preachee, provokee, shavee, (snubsee: 1787, Horace Walpole in a letter—not nonce.) 'Interpendent,' 'satisfidiction,' 'scientintically,' 'Shake-spear,' and 'Outlian' ('Italian') may be cited in conclusion.

- * Bib. 379, para. 4. A dictionary of Horatian eighteen-inch words from English and German might now be possible: 'preterpluparenthetical,' 'anti-disestablishmentarianism,' 'Konstantinopolitanische ddoodlepfieffermachergesellschaft,' 'unhypersymmetricoantiparallelepipedicalisationalographically,' &c. (all actually used.)

¶ Bib. 460 (Elton,) 471 (Groom,) 369 (Kitchin,) 373 (Krapp,) and

be difficult to talk about "the obsolescence of poetic diction." "There is, to be sure, no such thing as a purely esthetic term" (p. 93:) can as much be said concerning poetry? The least that can be said is that the true poet will always have words of his own. The poet has greatly augmented the power of words, if not their number. And his words have a way of living on: they seem little susceptible to any blight of time, circumstance. True, a form or use may be isolated, and many a term is "archaic;" but poetic words as such seem to remain in the language rather than to grow obsolete. The difference between archaism and obsolescence should be sharply drawn.*

The poet's words, like all words, must, once again in the thought of Dr. Johnson, be sought where they may be found. They may of course be found in great abundance in the New English Dictionary,^{[[} but it may be seriously questioned whether it is always best to look for them there. Yet even if we accept the judgment of its editors as to obsolescence, we should probably find only a few hundred words

379 (Marsh, para. 6, Milton's vocabulary.) Professor Krapp's chapter on "Diction" in the "Knowledge of English" (1927) emphasizes the notion that the English vocabulary is in itself all one; there is but one vocabulary upon which poet, genius, and ordinary individual alike can draw; but careful distinction between words as symbols of knowledge and things of power, that is, the use of words, is made (pp. 448 ff.)

* This is important. Others than Miss Miller (Appendix A) have too freely associated the words 'obsolete' and 'archaic,' have too closely connected the ideas in these words. In short, the word 'archaic,' like the word 'nonce,' needs, with the NED now at hand, to be fully explained, elaborated. When this is done, we will not be so apt to speak of "obsolete or archaic" terms, and certainly will be cautious of such an assertion as "Archaic words are in the process of becoming obsolete."

[[The use made of the Oxford Dictionary by Professor Elton (Bib. 460) or Mr. Groom (Bib. 471) is interesting; and the present writer does not mean to imply in the above statement, that most valuable use of the Dictionary cannot be made in studies of poetic diction.

"enbalméd" in poetry. One can point to the Oxford Dictionary and the judgment of its editors respecting such interesting "poetical" words as circumcrost, circumbind, circumflankt, circummortal, circumspacious, circumspangle, circumwalk (and others of like nature,) or whipping cheer, zonulet, enclaret, intext, justment, lautitious, vigil, well-
 , or one can merely find them in the poems of Robert Herrick. There is no mention of their being obsolete in the glossorial index of Grosart in 1876.* Nor did other editors think of them as being obsolete. Isolated they are, "peculiar to Herrick," but that is all. Poets, in the thought of Professor Gordon (Bib. 361,) do not aim to augment the vocabulary. Their reasons for creating new forms or putting new meaning into old words may be varied and linguistically interesting; but they probably seldom have more than a passing consciousness of what they may be doing to the vocabulary. A word suits a poet and serves his purpose: it is put into his poem, and the vocabulary of poetry, possibly of men, is thereby augmented. Do terms peculiar to poets and poetry never become obsolete, then? What is one to say of Thomson's 'bosom-slave' (a concubine,) Dryden's interesting warlock, and poetical obsolescences like yieldless (1651 and 1703, rare,) abashless (1571 and Browning in 1868,) disaffright, dis-
pale, disquietal, emule, encruelize, dædal (Keats,) and others?

* "The Complete Poems" edited by A. B. Grosart, London, 1876. See also footnotes pp. 32 and 110 of vol. iii. Herrick is most interesting for his diction. An appreciation will be found in a later edition, by George Saintsbury, 1893, Introd. p. xlv; and notes on Herrick's manner of resting his work and revising it, comparison of Ms. readings &c., were made by F. W. Moorman in an edition of 1915 (Oxford.) The writer of this dissertation has not yet had the pleasure of seeing a concordance recently made at the University of Virginia (?1930) which, he has been told, contains an appreciation of the poet's language.

About all that one can say is that these words are obsolete in the sense that they are themselves isolated and peculiar in form. Necessarily much poetry has been forgotten, lost; and in it, at least a few (relatively speaking) forms and uses of words. Great poetry will keep alive its own language, however "poetical;" it will perhaps even keep alive a word not especially poetical--thus the word 'sans' cited in Chapter II (p. 44.) However odd the use by Dryden of 'careless,' 'ear,' 'equinox,' and 'unsuceptible,'* we must allow his poetry would not be the same without these uses. Even minor poets attain their ends by creating jobler to rhyme with 'cobler' (1662,) by enormand for 'enormity,' or epithetic, or falsiloquence. We are particularly reminded of eighteenth century words and phrases. We who call a spade a spade may smile at Cowper's "tube, That fumes beneath his nose;" but as long as there are critics to be taken with this term, or use of it,† and as long as there are readers of "The Task," we may doubt if it is really obsolete (so the NED, 1736 and 1734 only,) it, and a few other terms or uses like it. An affected archaism like dirgy has, in the nature of things, much less chance of becoming celebrated (1830 W. Taylor German Poetry ...)‡

* 'Ear' 9b. "Used by Dryden in the description of a Roman plough [transl. L. auria] 1697 Dryd. Virg. Georg. l. 252 On either side the Head produced an Ear."

'Equinox' 4, for "equinoctial gale," 1637 Hind and Panther 3. 504 The wind .. Nor more than usual equinoxes blew.

'Warlock' 5. "By Dryden taken to mean: A warrior magically immune from wounds inflicted by certain metals. Dryden's sp. perh. indicates that he imagined the word to be fr. War [and] Luck. . . " 1697 Aeneis Ded (b) 4b) [Aeneas] was no War-luck

[Bib. 369 and esp. J. L. Lowes, "Convention and Revolt in Poetry."

] Scott's abbaye and emboscata (pseudo-archaic) are particularly interesting, and indicate the truth about archaism and obsolescence (p. 110) and, above, about great poetry keeping alive its own language.

to you." Occasionally a nonce-translation like shell-toad for Dutch 'schildpad' comes to view; and occasionally the translator's work is no translation at all, but a paraphrase—centgrave, borrowed from Ger. 'centgraf,' so to speak, by Seiden in 1762 to answer to OE. 'hundred-sealdor,' or presiding officer of the court of one hundred; cow-brawl, in a work of 1756 to transmit French 'ranz des vaches' into the vernacular; field-bishop for Fr. 'eveque des champs,' or rapport-work for 'ouvrage de rapport,' inlaid or mosaic work in Chardin's translation of Chardin; so also haunt-dole and 'ray' (sb.¹¹) and others.

The word 'paraphrase' above suggests the name of Edmund Gayton, paraphraser and annotator of Don Quixote in 1654 (Bib. 104.) The original edition, as remarked in the bibliography, is rich with unusual words, now obsolete, and might be nicely contrasted with a later edition of 1771, in which a wholesale deleting of Gayton's original stylistic effects, by John Potter the reviser, is evident. In the first edition, thus, the location of the knight's home "is smelt out:" in the second, "is easily understood;" in the first, it "breaks many a man's brains to find out" the head of the Nile: in the second, it "has puzzled many a one to find it out." Gayton liked to toy with words as much as anyone ever did, and put down forms like dispannel, disrump, disquire, distatch; ecstatize, emigrate, embowelling; exsensed, extramund, exudatory; elbowic, errantship; inchristianation, instabulation; husbandically, quadrivirate, snattock, Venenialis, whimseycado. In some of which forms is suggested a kind of affinity between a writer like Herrick (above,) another like Carlyle or Southey, and this amusing author, Gayton.

The words, obsolete and almost always unique or rare, in Richard Tomlinson's rendering of Renodæus' "Medicinal Dispensatory" 1800

Whatever may be thought about the obsolescence of words in poetry, it will not be denied that the poet has enriched the language by the uses he has put words to, and has at least modestly augmented its vocabulary. The translator, like the traveler, has imported words and forms of words. Most of those that have been lost to the vocabulary were of rarest occurrence, words chiefly from the Latin like abnutive, anethine (tr. Virgil,) antepone (Ariosto, Orl. Fur.,) calcineous, efflunced ('outpoured'—"as if ad. L.,") immistion (also immixion,) impar ("Those things are said to be impar of which one is greater than another,") infusate ("make dark-colored, dusky,") labefactate ("cause to totter,") paroecian ('a parish priest,') plumatile ("made of feathers,") violary ("a violet-bed,") volubilous ("apt to roll or turn,") winteran (tr. mod. L. "cortex Winteranus,") and glutining, "These [the beames of the Moon] clean contrary do refresh and mysten in a notable manner, leaving an aquatick, and viscuous glutining kind of sweat upon the glasse" (1658 R. White tr. of Digby.) Likewise from Greek, eucratic ("A state truly eucratic . . where good and ill are intermingled, but where the good preponderate,") simblic ("beehive"—"Mingled with liquid Pitch and Simblic Honey,") eberrylic (lb;) from German—spathy ('sperry,' 1757 and 1695 resp.;) from Italian—satrapon ("an important personage," 1650,) ventilar ("a fan," 1653;) from Spanish—valienton ("a bully, braggart," 1681:) and many others.

Especially interesting is Bailey's sillyton. 'Simpleton,' "A fanciful formation on Simple, a.," which Johnson called "low," was in the language at Bailey's time of translating Erasmus (the "Colloquies," 1725,) but he did not choose it for some reason to render Lat. inepta into English: "Sillyton, forbear railing, and hear what 's said

to English, would make a dictionary of obsolescence. They belong, many of them, to the domain of medicine; but a few of the more interesting may be just mentioned here: acroamare, adauge, adimpleate, alacriate, aromatary, glyperformous, dulcescate, edacity, effinge, ef8 fode, eustomachical, exorb, gigar, glablify, ileous, labefactate, opsony, panpharmacal, pharmacopoly, pregrand, prepoll, and tranquillitate. Of all which it may now be said, they are locked up in their dispensatory!

Of a very different kind are the bright and amusing words in the inimitable translations of Urquhart and Motteux, mid- and late-seventeenth century. The last word concerning the translator's art has not been spoken, but when it is, if ever it is, the names of Rabelais, Cotgrave, Urquhart, Motteux, will loom large in it. It would be interesting, as a chapter in this study of the translator's art, to detail, in a careful and matter-of-fact way, the extent, or probable extent, of Urquhart's debt to Cotgrave. Mr. John Willcock in his "Life" of Sir Thomas, Mr. Charles Whibley, in his most readable introduction to the handsome Tudor edition of Urquhart and Motteux, Sir William Craigie, and others, have broadly indicated the probable extent of this debt. (Bib. 154, 193, and 599.) Yet it is possible that estimations "on both sides" have not been too careful, and the promptings of the "original Relator," as S. T. C. called Rabelais, like the invisible push given by the ghost of Peter Grimm, perhaps were more valuable to Urquhart in his work than his edition of Cotgrave.

At the risk of profaning these literary temples, we shall look, in conclusion, at a very few words and meanings. Thus Urquhart renders the French 'empailetoque,' "muffled," by impaletocked—"His orison-mutterer impaletocked, or lap't up about the chin, like a

tufted whoop." He must take over directly the French in his picture (or rather Rabelais') of Master Janotus "in his most antick accoustrement Liripipionated with a graduates hood" &c. So "All-to-be dunced and philogrobolised in their braines." Cotgrave has quag and swag in rendering Fr. 'brimbaler;' and Urquhart writers of someone "quagswaging in the Lee." The English word is at least somewhat dialectal, "to shake to and fro." Rarely, the translator explains: "By way of apotherapie (that is, a making the body healthful by exercise) did recreate themselves in botteling up of hay . . . " Often, of course, he gave an English word a new twist: "With little Mattocks, Pickaxes, Grubbing-hooks, Cabbies [bèches], Pruning-knives, and other Instruments requisit for gardning." Elsewhere occur obsoletisms like figgins, flagonal, hyogaster, campanilian, inrum, bruzz, humdockdousse, celivagous, filopendulums, limpard, ninny-whoop, luagawap, ridibundal, vaticinatress, sussing.

Terms in Motteux' part, if not so numerous, are at least as interesting. Thus, polymix, "having many wicks," and obeliscolychny, learnedly from the Greek for simpler English 'light-house' (used twice in the 1694 translation,) and especially whoopcoat as a term of abuse, or wisify, "to make wise," in the Author's Prologue, "The World therefore, wisifying it self [orig. en sagissant], shall no longer dread the . . . Blossoms of Beans every . . . Spring." And there are others in which little stories might be found to lurk.

One takes one's leave reluctantly of such writers and such verbocination. Sir Thomas, writing in a Scottish prison and "so-jumping" with his printer in a "joynt expedition" to see if writer could "indite" as fast as printer could set up his pica type, believed that sometimes "words do suppone for the things they signify,"

and he also believed in the goodness of their service. Early in "Jewel" he defended himself and his brother-writers against such "fictimplicitary Gown-men" and "Archæomanetick Coxcombs" as mouthed Solomon of old: "There is nothing new under the sun:" and so tried to keep the language pure! Words served his purpose, "which was all he asked of them."

It has been the endeavor of the first three chapters to make reasonably fully and clearly apparent what modern writers, notably scholars and critics of the nineteenth century and down to date, have thought and said about the "life and growth" of language, about the waxing and waning of the English vocabulary; to submit comments and opinions, often fragmentary but sometimes pointedly helpful, of early modern English writers and thinkers and lexicographers; and to show and explain some of the ways in which the vocabulary grows. Unquestionably there was a literary kind of over-luxuriance in the seventeenth century, the period of our particular concern. The view of Professor Gordon, cited many pages back and in the bibliography (Item 361,) puts the matter as briefly as it can be put: the needed service and real usefulness of words in the late sixteenth century often vividly contrasts with the superabundance in the late seventeenth. How this superabundance was greatly, though not exclusively, literary in kind, the ensuing chapters try in part to show. They also try, eclectically and often by way of suggestion rather than dogmatically, to show what became of this overabundance, to explain some of the ways in which the vocabulary wanes.

II

CH. IV

Obsoletisms, it was remarked in an earlier chapter (p. 13,) seldom fall into disuse because of one reason or cause only. Indeed, before one can speak of disuse, one must make sure of the use of a word; and figures have been presented elsewhere (App. B) which strongly suggest that something less than a third of the 52,000-odd obsolete words in the New English Dictionary were scarcely used at all—dictionary, nonce, and learned and rare forms—and so really had no disuse to fall into. Nevertheless, having discovered our obsoletisms where they may most accessibly be found, we must make of them what we can. Perhaps we must occasionally imagine their use. An obsoletism that was never really used, in all probability, may yet ^{be suggestive} point a moral—dentiloquate. Whether laudable or not, finally, our destination is not the obsolete word, but a refinement of two notions, two ideas: "obsolescence" and "obsoleteness."*

The present chapter looks at a number of obsolete words from the viewpoint of phonetics. Unquestionably English sounds change, and help thereby to bring about the disuse of words. We shall, towards

* Vide Ch. I, paragraph 1.

Perhaps it would seem more ideal to take a handful of obsolete terms, such as are presented by Mr. Murison in the "Cambridge History" (Bib. 337 and p. 62; see also quotations from E. E. Wardale, footnote, p. 2, and from Meiklejohn, Bib. 591,) and merely discuss them. But this would be no adequate answer to the question, How and why do words grow obsolete? For that question, in the nature of our language, involves thousands of words, and the investigating of numerous approaches and possibilities. Hence, classifications are attempted in the chapters of parts II and III. The concluding chapter, on the other hand, will attempt a more synthetic treatment.

Our terminology must here be defined. The NED says under 'ob-

the end of the chapter, look briefly into an interesting little book recently written in America, Mrs. J. R. Aiken's "Why English Sounds Change." It describes, quite adequately, the obsolescence of a number of words whose disuse is attributable to change in people's speech. But the words discussed by Dr. Aiken belong to the Old English period whereas our concern is with words recently grown obsolete.

Relatively few words, since the seventeenth century, have become obsolete because of phonetic changes. Sound-change seems to involve (besides other things) much time. We have, in consequence, to do with questions of euphony, homophony, and economy. There is much uncertainty in it all. More than once we shall have to imagine the use of a word, some term of rarest written occurrence only, to suggest a point, a possibility. Our pattern here, while not very solid, may thus still have some sort of application to the vocabulary at large.

The euphony, or pleasantness or "musicalness" of sounds (as it has been defined,) is always an intriguing sort of subject, but the most that one can offer, to be sure, is a reason with his opinion.

solete' as an adjective: "no longer practiced or used." The adjective was perhaps first used in writing by E. K. in 1579; in 1743 Richardson in "Clarissa" gave it a substantive use; and the verb, 'obsoleted,' 'obsoleting,' now rare, was used between 1640 and 1873. 'Obsoleteness,' "the state or condition of being obsolete" (&c.) has been in the vocabulary since 1613. 'Obsoletion,' itself rare, was used in 1804 and again 1817 by Keats, speaking of the "obsoletion of Christmas gambols and pastimes." An 'obsoletism' is, of course, "an obsolete term, phrase, custom" (&c.,) and the word has been in use at least since 1799. It may also signify "the condition of being obsolete; obsoleteness," and was so used (earliest date) in 1824. See p. 11

The distinction between 'obsoleteness' and 'obsolescence' is sometimes carefully made and sometimes not. 'Obsolescence' properly means "the process of gradually falling into disuse or growing out of date; the becoming obsolete;" and we are, perhaps, a little surprized to see the lateness of the date here: 1823. The word has a special significance in biology. Johnson was among the first (apparently) to use the word 'obsolescent,' 1755, "s. v. Hereout."

Reasons, however, are not always easily produced.* Penn, in 1669, spoke of the "Alamodeness of [men's] Dress and Apparel;" and the word does not appear elsewhere. Yet we apparently needed a synonym like it for 'fashionableness' (&c.) and perhaps, if alamodeness were brought back, it would not be found as "musical" as our own 'alamodality' (1753, 1834 Southey, &c.) Two similar examples, and from the viewpoint of dates more interesting, are circumstantialness and 'circumstantiality.'[[Both first appear in Bailey, 1731, and were used throughout the eighteenth century; but the obsolete form disappeared sometime after 1811 (Gibbon,) whereas Scott in "Old Mortality" in 1810 and many subsequent writers use 'circumstantiality.']]

It is not often that we come across such word-pairs. Other possible examples are quite insufficient because utterly isolated. Yet words like bubbleable, aggravable, arguitively, degreecingly, De-

'All the words compounded of here and a preposition, except hereafter, are obsolete, or obsolescent.'" It has been much used ever since his day. Distinction in meaning between the two words ('obsoleteness' and 'obsolescence') will be observed in this study.

- * "The author of English Retraced in answering the question as to why the old Saxon gren fell into disuse says, 'there was another word perhaps a little more euphonious to supply its place. . . The same idea of mind requires but one word to express it, provided it is always the same; and as gren and gin were not both requisite, consequently the former yielded to the latter, so harberous and hospitable intimate too nearly the qualifications to require separate expressions; in consequence, harberous has disappeared and "hospitable" alone remains on duty.'"--Miss Miller (see App. A and Bib. 353.) Miss Miller elsewhere in her thesis instances 'magnet stone' versus magne-stone, 'marchioness' and marquiseess; also mahomery, mecop, mirtus, moustick, multangle.

[[As remarked in the explanatory note, obsolete words, except in informal lists or where otherwise stated, are underscored (thus.) and living words are put within single quotation marks ('thus.')

]] "Both first appear in Bailey" &c.—this statement, and all others like it, to follow, are made on the authority of the NED.

niedness, discriminable, disrelishable, distinctial, earlierness, earlily, graciousize, indissipable, irre-edifizable, lushish, pulverer, revivificate, shortestness, syrupical, translatitiously, uncharteral, though almost to a word used but once in writing, would manifestly have life miserable for most people. One does not mean to imply that the word bubbleable, for example, became obsolete because of its sound. It is the kind of word that invites investigation, and that, having been investigated, tempts the investigator to relay its story.¶ But the only obvious fact is that this word, like so many others, really had no chance to be disused. It is cited, together with the others above, more or less off-hand, merely to suggest that a sense for euphony is, nevertheless, at work among us.

This thought is perhaps borne closer to us if we turn to examples like discerpible, flowerist, individuism, onomatopy, and pastoritial. The first--discerpible--was used by More and others between 1655 and 1720, and then (1732 ff.) was supplanted by 'discerptible.'

* "Minimal length." 1674 N. Fairfax Bulk and Selv., "And though a point be the least of boak, and nowt the shortest of time, yet they may speak everlastingness and elifmillingness . . . for all their shortestness and leastness as well as the longest and the biggest." The terms aggravable, graciousize, and irre-edifiable, like many hundreds more, appear in the writings of seventeenth century divines (More, 1664, Beverley, 1701, Trapp, 1677.) Evelyn (1657) has indissipable: "The Soul . . . is indissipable otherwise than by a total annihilation;" and the word appears elsewhere. Dissipable is also obs. (1603--1710, several uses.) Pepys and Steele (and others) have earlily: "And so I parted, with great content, that I had so earlily seen him there," &c. Deniedness is in the "True Non-Conformist" of 1671, "Their deniedness unto all things, their absolute resignation unto . . . God." So revivificate in More. Syrupical in Gayton. Pulverer

["Capable of being duped." The word occurs in 1669 in "The Nicker Nickerd," "If the winner be bubbleable, they will insinuate themselves into his acquaintance." The word 'bubble' (sb. and v.) in the sense "dupe, gull" and "to cheat," (&c.) was much used in the 17--18th cs.: Wycherly, Sedley, De Foe, Goldsmith, D'Urfey, &c...

Forms like difficultate and difficillitate (both in Cotgrave, 1611, and the latter perhaps not wholly obsolete) may occasionally be found, and seem very awkward in the face of a simple phrase — 'to make (or render) difficulte.' Yet Southey characteristically in a letter in 1829 preferred to write of "The circumstances which facilitated or difficultated (if I may make such a word for the nonce) the introduction of Christianity." Individuism (obs. rare, one use) represents a different sort of case. The word may not be thought especially lacking in euphony; yet the long-established (1645 ff.) and therefore familiar, and, though longer, quite euphonic 'individuality' would have been against it if it had been even more used. Finally, the suffix -ism has become so distinctive (see Ch. VI below) that it may be doubted whether 'individuality' could really be a very perfect synonym of individuism. So onomatopy may be contrasted with 'onomatopoeia': the obsolete form was used in 1658 and again in 1822, but the living form has been in the language since at least 1577. Pastoritial (1654, Gayton, 1720, North,) pastoritious (Blount only, 1656,) and pastory (1752) likewise had little chance against 'pastoral' (1432,) and show how suffixes alone are responsible for the size of the English vocabulary.

The word flowerist is particularly interesting. We venture the suggestion that it is an example of Dr. Alken's "accord" theory (see below.) This obsolescence, at least, was used a number of times

will perchance be thought less euphonic than 'pulverizer,' although the obs. form was of 1773 ff. and the lvg., 1836 ff. Moreover, we do have forms like 'fosterer,' 'deliverer;' cf. Ch. VI, the interesting suffix -er. The word lushish would probably have no chance in our language. But the obsolescence of lushish is not due to disuse, or phonetic ease, or anything of the kind, once again; the word was still-born in Lovell.

between 1694 and 1713 or later, and appeared in the "London Gazette." But the form 'florist' (same root, Latin 'floris,') in the vocabulary since 1623 or so, has better "accord." It will be interesting presently to detail words like fanationess and 'fanaticalness' (1622, 1665 and 1668 respectively,) to see if here too the line of sounds is simplified, reduced. It is true that 'fanaticalness' has more syllables, but it is just possible that the 'l' of 'ical,' according with the 'n' of 'news,' "makes up" for the effort of the extra syllable. Flutenist ("cf. Ger. flötenist"—NED) was used in translations and in the "Free-Thinker" between 1647 and 1718; but our own 'flutist' was before it, 1603 ff., and obviously is a less difficult form. The sounds in interpretess (1717, Lady M. W. Montague in a letter) do not "accord" as well as they do in its variant form 'interpretress,' perhaps (1775 ff.) So justificable (1655) and 'justifiable' (1561, ad. 13th c. Fr.,) and phantasmagoriacal (1823 Blackwood's "Deucalion sees a phantasmagoriacal shadow . . .") and 'phantasmagorial' (1828; forms in '-ially,' '-ian,' '-ic(al)' all 1822 ff.,) so scientist (1773 only) and 'scientist' (1840.) Like phantasmagoriacal was syzygiacal (1672,) replaced by 'syzygial.' Ozell in his translation of Rabelais spoke of a Scotchism (1737;) we speak of a 'Scotticism' (1717.) A form like spirituascence (obs. rare, 1657) would probably have little chance against 'spirituosity' (1669,) or suspectuous (1657 only, OFr. 'suspectaeux') against 'suspicious' (c. 1400.) Analogy aside, uninterested (1647) does not "accord," in its sound pattern, as well as does 'uninterested' (known in senses now obsolete as early as 1646.)

Miss Miller in her thesis (Appendix A) presents at least three interesting examples: magnes, moustick, and multangle. The first was

used between 1399 and 1750; but cacophony in a compound, magnes-stone, perhaps made the form 'magnet' (c. 1400) seem more reasonable. Mous-tick, used in English between 1666 and 1800, has been outlived by 'mosquito' (c. 1533 ff.) Multangle (1674--1733) is no longer used, but the possibly more euphonic 'polygon' (1571) is. Elsewhere Miss Miller characterizes misucceeding as showing isolation in its prefix, rivalry of mis- and ill-, and as lacking euphony. It was used between 1656 and 1661. The only known use of mechanicism is that of 1710; 'mechanism' has been in the language since c. 1677. Most interesting, perchance, is misshapement. Though used only in 1653, it is by no means an unlikely sort of word. It is "of" a large family of words. 'Deformity' (1450) its "rival," cannot boast a larger. The fact is not as Miss Miller states: "Native word driven out by a foreign [French] word;" but why? Quite obviously because the foreign form was there long before Henry More wrote (and he appears to be the only user of the "native" word) in 1677, "What is that outward mis-shapement of Body, to the inward deformity of their souls?" There was no native word present to be ousted by a foreign word. Nevertheless, there is unquestionably some truth in Miss Miller's statement; and it is quite possible that misshapement had and would have little chance against 'deformity' partly on the ground of euphony. One feels, however, that it is the kind of word Carlyle might deliberately, in the face of 'deformity,' have used. With people like Carlyle about, the use of such a word impends.

All of these words seem to belong so intimately to the written language. And it must be confessed that in that language there is little that is strange about many of them. Ozell in his *Rabelais* (1737) very naturally contrasted a "Scotch-ism" with an "Irishism,"

which latter form is very much with us today. We lift, in behalf of our special purpose, the word or form from the page, and attempt pronouncing it; but theirs was a language purely of the eye and for it. This, in all conjectures and illustrations, we must not forget. Nor may we be blind to the possibility of Scotchism being used today. Even the form Scotism got itself recorded. Obsoleteisms, like the King's English, have a strange way of coming into vogue from time to time.

The most that we can say is that use alone often takes care of our feeling for euphony in words. Neither euphony nor accord, in any final analysis of words, can be talked about in an absolute manner. We are used to 'inflammable' (1605,) and fireable, the "native" form (1662 only,) would look and sound odd--that is all. We speak of an 'appendage' (1649,) and a form of Hale's, 1677, appendication, would seem needlessly burdensome. The word defamator occurs in a tract or book of 1704, "We should keep in pay a brigade of hunters to ferret our defamators;" but the language had for a long time had a briefer form, 'defamer' (a. 1340 ff.) "Economy of effort" applies to forms like circumspectious (1649, 1656,) wherein the suffix is manifestly unneeded: 'circumspect' (1422 ff.)*

* So autocratoric (1678; 1659, 1769: -ical) and 'autocratic' (1823, Byron;) alacrioness (a. 1660 only) and 'alacrity' (1510;) angelicalness (1664 and 1667, both H. More, only uses; 'angelicness' &c. not recorded;) balsamitic (1667 Waterhouse, only use) and 'balsamic' (1676 ff;) appropriationate (1662 H. More, only use) and 'to proportion;' atomicism (1673 Cudworth, only use) and 'Atomism' (l. "atomic philosophy," also in Cudworth;) coactivity (1659--1738) and 'coaction' (a. 1400 ff;) concentricate (1641, 1652, 1737) and 'concentrate' (1640 ff;) conglobulate (1702, 1753) and 'conglobate' (1665 ff;) coincide (obs. rare, 1657, 1659) and 'coincide' (1641 ff;) consumptioner (1662, 1682, 1734) and 'consumer' (1535 ff;) Crypto-Calvinianism (1760; many such forms; cf. Latitudinism, Millenarism, &c.) and 'Crypto-Calvinism' (1856, 1883 ff;) degrad-

Euphony, finally, is most distinctly a matter of pronunciation, not of beauty of sound in any given word apart. Professor Krapp, in his "Knowledge of English," pages 370 ff., shows how this is so. He explains, in brief, the futility of prejudices doing violence or near-violence to English sounds, the pronunciation of words. "The question of choice between two sounds is of practical importance in language only when the possibility of employing two different sounds in the same word is present" (p. 372.)

We turn, before coming to the singularly interesting matter of homophony, to two or three lesser subjects: soundingness, variation, foreign accent or pronunciation, and onomatopœia. All are interesting, but it is again doubtful whether really valuable illustrations may be had from the periods of our investigation.

uate (1649, Evelyn in Mem., 1914) and 'degrade' (1325;) dentical (1776, "A Treatise on Toothpicking, wherein I show the precise method of holding, handling . . . and replacing the dentical instruments"—only use) and 'dental' (adj., lb. 1370 [dentistry;]) derisionary (a. 1704; so derisorious, 1644 and 1631, both H. More) 'derisory' (1613;) destituent (1660 Jer. Taylor, ". . . destituent or wanting") and 'destitute' (1513;) discretionable (1799) and 'discreet' (1340;) discretionary (3. 1735; so also discretionary Steele Spect. 1712) and 'discreet;' distributioner (1650 Elderfield [2 uses]) and 'distributor' (1526; 'distributionist' has in Dickens [1836 Boz] a special meaning;) dowageable (1655) and 'dowable' (1535;) dubitancy (1648—1699) and 'doubt' (1225;) duellion (1728 only) and 'duel' (1645; duellism 1609 Donne Lett.;) duplicatory (1659 only) and 'double;' effectuousness (Obs. rare, 1686 Goad Celest. Bodies "The ---- of the Semisextile . . .") and 'efficacy;' efficienciary (1649 only;) emphaticalness (a. 1665 and 1663) and 'emphasis' (1573;) empiricalness (1654) and 'empiricism;' enigmaticalness (1634 only;) espinette (see p. 79;) espontoon (1772—1838) and 'spontoon' (1746;) exceptionation (ad. late L., 1662 only use) and 'exception' (1385;) exostosed (1758) and 'exostosed' (also 1758;) experimentator (1651—1748) and 'experimenter' (1570;) expositure (1793 only) and 'exposure' (1664;) ensurancer (1665 Stillingfleet) and 'assurer' (1607;) financial (1300) and 'financial' (1769;) gelataneous (1763 only, ad. It.) and 'gelatine' (1713) and 'gelatinous' (1724;) literatury (1652 Urq. Jewel) and 'literary'

Thus we can only be doubtful over a word like coit. "If from the coit of these Animals . . . Animals should be born:" so reads in part a "Philosophical Transaction" of 1671. The word was used subsequently (1745 and 1766.) The verb coite, "unite," is of much earlier date: 1575 (of nerves.) But 'coition' (sexual) was much more importantly in the language since at least 1615. The most that one can say is that the word is much needed; and where need urgently exists, usually an adequate sort of form is forthcoming. Today we should scarcely consider the form coit, in all probability, to be useful.

(1749;) nominance (1642) and 'name' (1662;) 'nomination' is not a synonym here;) notificative (1652 only) and 'designative' (1611;) oleated (1661 only,) 'oiled' (1535;) opinionate (1651-1677,) 'opine' (1598;) ossificated (1727, 1765,) 'ossified' (1798;) peccaminous (1668 H. More "Div. Dial" "In regard of our peccaminous terrestrial Personalities here") and 'peccant' (1604; these are, perhaps, exceptional examples. Both of these terms have a formidable rival in the words 'sin,' 'sinful,' with their huge and important family. Of course we have 'peccable,' 'peccability,' 'peccadillo,' 'peccancy,' 'peccant;') phantasmatical (1642 H. More "Song of Soul," 1658, a. 1688 Cudworth) and 'phantasmal' (1813 ff.); pharmacopoly (1657 Tomlinson) and 'drug-store,' 'chemist's; placentious (a. 1661 Fuller, 1683 Pettus "Fleta Min.") and 'pleasing' (1362;) Platonician (1741 tr. D'Argens' Chinese Lett., 1776 Gibbon, 1829) and 'Platonist' (1549;) predatitious (1659 Gauden "Sermon," 1675 Evelyn "Terra,") predatorial (c. 1781 title—only use) and 'predatory' (1589;) presentaneous (1656 Blount—1668) and 'present' (1340;) pyrotechnician (obs. rare, 1729 Shelvocke "Artillery," 1731) and 'pyrotechnian' (rare—no examples, Bailey) and 'pyrotechnist' (1791;) reptible (1655,) 'reptile' (1390;) Republicarian (1682 "London Gazette," 1689 Evelyn "Diary") and 'Republican' (1712;) roomthily (1674,) 'spatially; Samscredemic (1800,) 'Sanskrit' (1617;) suspiciency (obs. r., a. 1690,) 'suspicion' (1303;) suspicionable (obs. r., 1692 Beverley,) 'suspectable' (1748;) synodetic (obs. r., 1661,) 'synodal' (1579;) tartarized (1720,) 'tartarized' (1648 ff.); testamentation (a. 1765 BBurke, only use,) 'testation' (1832 [this meaning;]) testamentize (c. 1661 only, Fuller;) triplicitate (1657 Tomlinson,) 'to triple' (1375;) tropologetically (extended form of 'tropologically,' after 'apologetically;') 'tropologically' (1549,) 'tropically' (1564; Urq. in "Jewel" uses the obs. form: "I could have enlarged this discourse . . . tropologetically, by metonymical, ironical, metaphorical and synecdochical instruments of elocution;") vacuitous (1766 only) and 'vacuous' (1655;) vagrarious (n-w., 1795 only) and 'vagrant' (1444;) venditor (1698, 1733) and 'vendor' (1594;) veniable (obs.

Yet if we look elsewhere, we are not likely to find other examples as good as coit. O, oe, are strange and single verb-forms which might be accounted "insignificant in sound." Feltham in his "Resolves" apparently realized this, and coupled his word (for it does not occur elsewhere--obs. rare) with another in speaking of the stage, "oe'd and spangled in their gawdiest type." Ens and esse, both foreignisms, it may seem to us, do not especially dignify the language of philosophy or language at large. Yet the one is still used in philosophy (though it is obsolete in the sense of "essence," where the dates are 1649 and 1730,) and the phrase 'in esse,' "in actual existence," has been more or less in vogue since 1592 (though here again, in another sense, "essential nature," esse is obsolete--1642.) Versal (1657 only) probably would not stand against the well-established, longer 'versification' (1821 [this sense.]) Morph, anglicized form of 'morphew', was used but once, by Gres in 1681. Miss Miller marked it as a "word insignificant in sound;" and so perhaps it is; but morphew is also ob-

r. 1646 Browne [2 uses; also venially] and 'venial' (1300 ff.); verbosious (obs.--one use: 1676 J. Smith "Old Age" "Among all the Verbosious Gracians there is not one compleat Tract upon this Subject only") and 'verbose' (1672; vestigiary (1651) and 'vestige' (1602, ad. Fr. fr. Lat.); visitationer ("one who performs, or takes part in, a visitation," 1670 Eachard "Clergy;") volitable (a. 1690 Hopkins "Sermon" only use) and 'volatile' (1300; working-shop (1783) and 'workshop' (1582; so working place, 1544; 'working-box' 1838, 'workbox' 1811; others.

Miss Miller submits: machinament (1674) and 'contrivance' (1697; 'machine' (1549,) 'engine' (1615;) magisteriality (1651--1713,) 'mastership' (1387;) magisterialness (1651--1713,) 'domination' (c. 1386 ff.); maledicency (1653--1723) and 'malice' (1297;) manuductor (1657--1677,) 'guide' (1362,) 'director' (1477,) and (in the sense of "conductor of a band," 1785--1852,) 'conductor' (1820 ff.); Marianolatry (1736--1755,) 'Mariolatry' (1612 ff.); melanochoallographer ("engraver of copper plates for printing," 1697;) meteorologies (1700--1837,) 'meteorology' (1620;) meteoroscopies (1788,) 'astronomy' (1205;) mixtible (1750,) 'mixtil' (1654, but also obs.); murmurator (1670--1689) and 'murmurer' (1526,) 'detractor' (1382;) Muscoviter (1650--1671) and 'Muscovite' (1555;) mandament (1834 on-

solete (a. 1400—1835) as a term that in science and elsewhere has evidently served its time (cf. 'leperous,' &c.) In false (1707, translation) and 'falsetto' (1774,) we have the triumph of a foreignism over a perhaps less impressive anglicized form—except for the fact, one must straightway add, that the anglicized form was probably little actually used. Ob, 'wizard' (1550,) 'magician' (c. 1384,) 'sorcerer' (1526,) 'ventriloquist' (1656, Blount,) was an adaption from the Hebrew by Gauden in 1659. Its synonyms or near-synonyms demonstrate once again the fulness of English. Ob itself may be held to have sound-mystery; but it is utterly small and isolated. With the fuller form 'scrivener' (1375) in the language, scriver, used in the 'London Gazette' and elsewhere at the end of the seventeenth century, apparently had little chance. The determining factor in the case of sophumer was its single use in 1653. 'Sophomore' has been in use since 1638. The use by L'Estrange in 1654 of st as an adjective, "For three dayes all was so 'st, so calm on both sides," is interesting. Supern (obs. a. OFr.) might be thought poetical for 'supernal'

ly) and 'injunction' (1526,) 'mandate' (1576,) 'command' (1552;) manuporter ("one who carries by strength of hand," 1688—really no actual use of word known) and 'porter' (1382;) manusculpture ("carving or engraving by hand," 1704 only) and 'sculpture' (1390;) merul (1694 only) and 'merle' (the blackbird, 1483 ff.;;) mimication (1716 only actual use) and 'mimicing' (1723,) 'counterfeit' (1340;) mobilification (1794) and 'mobilization' (1799;) mollition (1657) and 'softening' (1568; also word-families here, and associations;) mutuatitil (1654 only.) In at least a few of these, other causes of obsolescence attend, Miss Miller states. Under magneticalness (a reasonable sort of form) she gives: "wider association" and "isolation in stem"—which latter point is hardly possible, unless one understand by "stem" 'magnetical' vs. 'magnetic.' The obsolescism was used in 1756 only. Cf. 'magnetism.' Salariate (1656 J. Harrington, 1672, 1687) and 'to salary' (1477;) rhinocerical (var. humorous assns. 1639—1790) and 'rhinocerotic' (1755;) geodesian (1656--1690) and 'surveyor;' gravaminous (1659 D. Pell--1721) and 'grievous' (1375;) indical (1661 only) and 'index' (? ;) propriatarious (1657) and 'proprietary' (1450;)

(1485,) yet was used in prose writing; while supplete (obs. rare, 1664) was replaced, first in Scottish writers, by 'supplement' (1829; contrast 'supplemental,' 1605 Bacon.) Chem, finally, cited in the first chapter (pp. 22--23,) though marked not only obsolete but also rare in the NED (1715,) is heard today in Edinburgh classrooms.* Chymics, 1683, was perhaps another "try." 'Chemistry' from 1646 has been the established full form.

In all these examples there is, to be sure, little that satisfies. The question of significance in sound is indeed a remote kind of question.[] We know of certain celebrated clipped forms of the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries: cit, 'mob,' 'pun,' 'fop,' 'prig,' doodle, noodle, 'humbug,' dilly—indeed, a whole line-up of shortened, syncopated, aphetic and similar forms of words.

tend (1655, "action or fact of tending, tendency;") tern (1760 [2,] 1828) and 'ternate;' and many, many others.

Dates in the above lists are interesting. Thus, the obs. form autocratoric is earlier by a century and a half than the living form 'autocratic,' and like it are some 17 others out of 76 in all; for the most part the living form is earlier—'alacrity' (1510) and alacriousness (1660 only:) so some 57 examples above; and 2 or 3, 'balsamic,' 'Atomism,' 'mimicing,' and their obs. forms, are close in dates. Quite often the lvg. form is much earlier than the obs.: 'discreet,' 'distributor,' 'dowable,' 'suspicion,' 'venial,' 'volatile,' 'workshop.' Es-pinette, exostosated, &c., are practically identical in dates.

* My friend Mr. William Mould assures me of its use in Canada, where the feeling is that it is a dignified old term. Professors and teachers at the Royal College in Edinburgh commonly so use it. It is not slang. Schoolboys' slang for 'chemistry' is, of course, plain 'chem.'

[] "As a comprehensive explanation of the change in speech sounds, the theory of economy of effort is very unsatisfactory. The truth is that any forms of speech that one is familiar with and has frequently produced seem easy and economical compared with less familiar or unknown sounds. Ease and difficulty in speech are very largely relative matters."—G. P. Krapp in "The Knowledge of English," 1927, p. 364. Professor Krapp instances 'asked' with its [skt] sound. The whole paragraph is apropos.

But these (to be discussed in the ensuing chapter) do not illustrate the point in question. Cit and fop have gone out of fashion (Cit is called "archaic" in the NED,) and are essentially obsolete; yet we know their meanings today. They are not remotely obsolete. Clipped words are often voguish or convenient, and their phonetic brevity is no handicap.* We turn to a somewhat less troublesome consideration: phonetic variants.

Their number is legion. Like the examples under classifications in the next chapter, they illustrate as nothing else can the way in which words are simply piled up in our vocabulary. It has been a slow process since, let us say, Chaucer's time or Shakespeare's—a long time of accumulation, of exits and re-entries ("reborrowing," as it is called, of terms from abroad,) of (which is our special concern here) reworking, phonetic change and adjustment. Analogy plays an amazingly large part. Without particularizing we may glance at forms like detainder (perhaps influenced by 'attainder,' 'remainder,' 1672, 1701 Beverley) and 'detainer' (1612,) apprensive (1639) and 'apprehensive' (1398,) abilitation (c. 1656) and 'habilitation' (1612,) Bashalic(k) (Turkish, earlier [1632, 1703] form of:) 'Pashalik' (1745,) cadee (1689 Mrs. Behn—1789, phonetic spelling of:) 'cadet' (Fr., gentleman cadet in the army; the English 'cadet' dates from 1651,) card (1653 Evelyn, 1704, 1727) and 'chard' (1653 Evelyn,) draught-boy (1637) and 'draft-' and 'draw-boy,' drīb (1632) and 'drip,' dulcid (1657—1693) and 'dulcet' (1477,) duplet (1663 Etyden) and 'doublet' (3a. 1450,) earning (1631, 1711 Steele Spect. "The generous Earnings of Distress") and 'yearning' (c. 1597,) flauging (1632, ?:)

* McKnight (Bib. 330,) p. 300, and infra, pp. 204 ff.

(1495,) yet was used in prose writing; while supplète, first used in

Scottish writings (

'flogging' (1758,) gom (1694 only, " . . . a Jews-Trump, or little Gom") and 'gong' (c.1600,) grabble (sb., 1650) and 'grapple' (1530,) hatch (1653) and 'hack' (1620,) lulibub (1710 Celia Fiennes Diary "Several little Coke-houses where you have fruits, lulibubs and . . . Liqueurs") and 'lollipop' (1796.)

Nuisome, like detainder, used by Bolingbroke in 1733, is a lone obsolete variant of 'noisome' after 'nuisance;' but 'noisome' is also obsolete in this particular sense (1548, 1570, 1653: "Annoying.") Lionel Wafer in his "Voyage" (pub. 1685) speaks of paracood where we now have (in certain "waters") 'barracuda' (1678.) Puggered, used by More in 1653, and elsewhere in 1706, is perhaps a variant of 'puckered' (1611.) So guinombrom (1659) and 'conuñdrum' (1605,) ranch-sieve (1669 Digby) and 'range-sieve' (dialectal, 1538—1891,) rangy (1657) and 'range' (13c. 1726 ff.,) simperingly (obs. exc. dial., a. 1648 Digby) and 'simmeringly' (1681; compare 'simperingly' meaning "in a simpering manner," 1592,) shock-dog (1673—1845) and 'shaggy,' solebaiting (1652,) alteration of 'surbaiting,' sopless (1651) and 'sapless' (1591,) squibbler (1671, 1674, alteration, perhaps after 'squib,' of:) 'quibbler' (c.1680,) strumble (1681 only; 'rumble'? 1645, 'stumble'? c.1325,) stockado (much used: 1647 Sprigge, 1699 Dampier Voy., 1701 C. Wolley, 1765 R. Rogers; altered form of:) 'stoccado' (Ital., Fr., marked archaic by Webster, "a thrust, stab,") swaff (1688 Holme) and 'zwafh' (c.1888,) tabarin (1765 Sterne, 1871) and 'tambourine' (c. 1500 ff.,) tacid (1651 J. Freake, 1659) and 'tacit' (1605,) tarpaulian (a. 1656 Ussher, c. 1660—1719 [3 uses in poetry]) and 'tarpaulin' (1605 ff.,) tavasco (1652) and 'tabasco' (1898,) tayout (1808 Scott,) thistolow (obs. rare, 1684 Hannah Woolley [2 uses] a dialectal substitute of 'th' for 'f:' compare thane (fane), thetch,

thraill, thrae, throm) and 'fistolow,' 'fistula' (1481,) thraill (1674) and 'fraill' (13..,) timen (1756) and 'tamin' (crape, 1552,) tittee (1756) and 'teetee,' transcrive (1665) and 'transcribe' (1552,) vandaliro (a. 1660) and 'bandoleer' (1577,) Venedic (fr. med. L., 1768 1790) and 'Wendish' (1614,) 'Vendish' (no dates given in NED,) wainable (AF. dial. var. of 'gaignable,' 1706) and 'gainable.' Such is no complete list, but it is perhaps representative.

Particularly interesting are the rare words smuss and slabberdegullion. The first is a phonetic alteration of 'muss,' and signified "to take by force:" "would scramble for and smuss [Fr. grapiller] [the knickknacks] of other Children his Playfellows." So reads the translation of Eliza Stanley, 1736. Slabberdegullion, dialectal, from Dutch or Low German, used by both Urquhart and Motteux in their translation of Rabelais (1653 and 1694,) answers to a previous form which is still in use, 'slubberdegullion' (1616 Beaumont and Fletcher, 1630, 1663, &c.—1905.) The Dutch has 'overalubberen;' 'schlupperen,' 'schlubbern' in the German; and the 'degullion' is a fanciful addition.*

Prudery is sometimes responsible for foreign "dangers," such as the introduction or re-introduction of 'æ' or 'œ' into English, or of a foreign plural like '-ium.' Thus, happily, words like exaun (1678 Butler in "Hudibras," "This comes of Breaking Covenants, And setting up Exauns of Saints") and gentee (1664 and 1680, also both Butler's) both meant to represent French pronunciations, found no place in English. Some remarkable adjustments have taken place.[]

* See discussion of by-forms (&c.) in the next chapter, p. 162. x

[] See footnote to Sect. VI of Bib., p. 657. Restoration of foreign pronunciation seldom if ever causes complete loss; rather the anglicized form passes and the foreign gains vogue (Miller.) x

Yet it may be questioned whether sound has had much part in these adjustments. Acin from the French may be submitted. It was used in the "Philosophical Transactions" for 1693. But the science of botany later (1751, 1832) had the term, a foreignism from the Latin, 'acinus.' So anæsthesia, 1848, obsolete inffavor of the earlier form 'anæsthesia' (foreignism.) There is a needless abundance in the case of calaminar-y (1662--1860:) calaminar, calaminary, 'calaminaris' (foreignism,) 'calamine' (1577 ff.) and czarin (obsolete form from the German, 1716 "London Gazette:") 'czarina' (1717, Ital., Sp., Pg.,) 'czarita' (1698, foreignism from the Russian.) Burst-cow was an "old name for the Buprestis," an insect of the ancients, unidentified, very harmful to cattle. 'Buprestis' is a foreignism in use since the end of the fourteenth century (1398.) Burst-cow was used by Sir Thomas Browne in his "Pseudodoxia Epidemica," and again by Rowland in 1658: "I . . . adventure to call it by a new name in English, Burncow, or Burstcow," and finally in 1706. Campagna, campagnia, from the Italian, appear to have been travelers' words between 1641 and 1717: Maundrell, Berkeley, Evelyn, and others abroad. "He who hath not made two or three campagnas (as they use to term it) by the time that he is 18 years of age:" so Evelyn in 1652. Cogname was used by Crowne in 1685 ("Sir Courtay Nice;") 'surname' (1375) and 'cognomen' (foreignism, meaning "nickname," 1811, meaning "surname," 1809) are our words. 'Chowry' (foreignism, 1777, sometimes a signal of Asiatic royalty) has at length triumphed over the common seventeenth-eighteenth century cow-tail (elephants with cow-tails hanging at their ears like great mustaches, in a 1671 translation—1840.) Curtan, the anglicized form of French 'curtana' (1259,) enjoyed use in Dampier (1698, 1699.) Italian 'chiaroscuro' ("treatment of light and shade

in a picture," 1636) was temporarily set aside for claro obscuro, a Latin spelling, 1706--1799. Empyreum (1665 and 1727) is the anglicized form of 'empyreuma' (Greek, 1641 ff.,) entrade (1670 G. H. in his "History of Cardinals") of 'entrada,' 'entrado' (also obsolete, 1613--1654,) epigaster (1653 Urquhart "Rabelais") of French 'epigastrium' (1631 translation,) ergoteer (verb, as if from a substantive, and confused with 'ergot,' 1637 Stillingfleet [2]) of French 'ergoteur' (1831;) lantone (1733 Miller "Gard. Dict.") of 'lantana' (1791,) octave rime (1700 Dryden in "Pref. Fables") of 'ottava rima' (Shelley in a letter, 1820,) onisc (1661 Lovell) of 'oniscus' (Zoölogy, 1843,) pavonaceous (1633 Holme) of 'pavonazzo' (1816:) ~~So~~ Would it be possible to submit many dozens of words.* The notable thing about all, or almost all, is the rareness of actual occurrence. It is indeed rare that one finds a form like virgoule, which was used at least a few times between 1699 (Evelyn) and 1741 ('virgouleuse,' 1693 ff.) We have no way of knowing whether these terms were used in speech.

* Fasts, anglic. form of 'fasti,' "annals, records," 1705 "Philos. Trans.;" hagiography (1812 in "Mo. Rev.,") and hagiographa (1583 —, foreignism meaning "all the books in the Bible which are not the "Laws" or the "Prophets;") interposit (obs. r., a. 1827 W. Mitford,) Fr. 'entrepot' (fgnsm. 1721, 1753 Chesterfield "Lett.;" interpost (obs. r. 1695 Motteux "St. Olon's Morocco") and 'entrepot;' naul (1724) angl. form of 'naulum;' paw (sb. 3, 1660 Waterhouse, 1693 Fryer) an anglic. representa. of Fr. 'pas,' "step," — 'grand pas;' peccadillie (1660 F. Brooke tr. "Le Blanc's Trav.") anglic. form of 'peccadillio' (fr. Sp., 1591 ff.;;) pedilave (obs. rare or error? L. 'pediluvium' [fgnsm., 1693 ff.] 1710 T. Fuller;) pericrany (1653--1735, Ozell, Swift) angl. form of 'pericranium' (1525, 1541, 1653--ff.;;) phenomen (1644, 1652 H. LeStrange) angl. form of 'phenomenon' (1639 ff.;;) quæsite (1655) angl. form of 'quæsitum' (1748;) raspy (obs. rare, 1703) anglic. form of Fr. 'raspé' (also obs. in Fr.;;) ridott (obs. rare 1748 Ramsay) angl. form of 'ridotto' (;) roundo (1710 Pope, 1751 Earl Orrery, 1765 Percy) anglic fr. Fr. 'rondeau' (1525;) signantly (a. 1656 Vines "Lord's Supper") and 'signanter' (fgnsm. Late Lat., "expressly, distinctly," 1614, 1651 ff.;;) singulture (1657 Tomlinson) and 'singultus' (1754 ff., "the hiccups;") strategie (obs. rare,

An equal if not a greater number of alien words have given way before native terms. But here again it is doubtful if the reason was, except in a most general manner, phonetic. Mainly these alienisms are of rarest occurrence. It is interesting to see whence they come, and the kind of bows some of them seem to make in literature. We are herein again impressed by the fact that the obsolescence of words cannot be considered apart from their first appearances and manner of sojourn in our language.

Thus famoso, "a notorious person," 1663 "Flagellum," perdido "a desperado," a. 1734 North, politicone, "a politician (with hostile or contemptuous connexion)," again in North, presultor, "one who leads the dance," 1673 Cudworth in his "Intellectual System, "God . . . the Præsultor, beginning the Dance and Musick," prognostes, "a prognosticator, a foreteller," 1654 Gataker, "I soon perceived, that I had proved a true Prognostes, and much truer than Lillie," ventriloquus, "a ventriloquist" (which form is in Blount, 1656,) 1644 Digby, violento "a violent person," a. 1661 Fuller in his "Worthies," are all of rarest occurrence. It is reasonable that this should be so. For prognostes we already had an "English" word—'prognosticator' (1552 ff.) and likewise for perdido—'desperado' (1647 Ward in his "Simple Cobler," ff.) and ventriloquus—'ventriloquist,' and politicone—'politician' (1539;) famoso, presultor, and violento we apparently

1303 Mitford "Hist. Greece,") 'strategus' (fgnsm. 1656 ff.); succedany ("substitute," 1657 Tomlinson) and 'succedaneum' (of which it is an angl. form;) syntagm (1621—1673) anglie. of 'syntagma' (a "regular or orderly collection of statements," 1644 ff.); tessel (1657 Tomlinson, "a small tessera:") ad. L. or Ital. 'tessella' (fgnsm. 1693;) tornado (1727, 1813 Scott,) "tornado" (1556 ff.); troque (1743,) 'trochus' (1706;) vappe (1657, 1660 Taylor,) 'vappa' (a flat wine, 1629--1840, now rare;) fripon, glacery, dædal, hypogaster, euchologue, mosal, &c., &c.

do not need. Besides 'prognosticator,' it may be noted, we have the synonym 'foreteller,' first interestingly used in a definition in 1580: "Pronostiqueur, a foreteller, a deuine which telleth things to come." And a book like Roget's "Thesaurus" reveals many other such synonyms. But we have kept the foreignism 'virtuoso' because, since 1662 or thereabouts, it has filled a genuine need in the language. An anglicized form, virtuose, was singularly used a. 1721.

"The Germane Travellers . . did put in their stam-books the Dimensions of . . the Ampitheaters." So wrote Gerbier in 1662. His word—stam-book—is a foreignism and obsolete. Travelers put in their memorandum books more than dimensions. In Howell on "Naples," 1652, we read of "the Torrion of Carmine" and its ordinance. This is, to be sure, hardly a memorandum book; but it is like some travelers' books in its relations. So Addison's escargatoire, a misspelling of French 'escargotiere,' "a place for rearing snails," from his accounts of "Italy" (1705.) So afresca in Evelyn (a. 1706) and Pepys' bummery, so Sir T. Herbert's enamorado in his "Travels" of 1677, and in a writing of 1743 prefetto.

Evelyn in his translation in 1664 of Freart (a book on architecture) spoke of "Tuscan Profiles"—"les profileures Toscanes." Elsewhere he mentioned "Bosse's invention of the Eschoppe," a "steel-pointed tool for engraving in copper," a 'graver' (1703 ff.) Unlike these two words was ritratto, which was used not once only, but at least a few times: by Richardson in a book on Italian statues, 1722, by North about 1734, and by Walpole between 1762 and 1771. Vrac is not only a foreignism and obsolete, but dialectal, coming from the Channel Islands: "A seaweed . . used for fael and manure," 1610 to 1881.

More literary and popular in character are letterato, eschantillon, scaldabanco, papalina, entrata, and venenialia, or intrigo intrico, divertissant, lever, and cockalane. Most of these, again, are of rarest appearance. The first explains itself; eschantillon Pope used in a letter in 1720—a "fragment." Hacket spoke of "The Presbyterians, those Scaldabanco's, or hot Declamers [sic]" in 1670. The word is from the Italian, 'to heat' and 'bench.' Gayton wrote of venenialia or venial sins in his "Pleasant Notes," 1654. Intrigo was used by Herbert, Shadwell, Villiers, Marvell, and perhaps others between 1648 and 1676. For it we had the word 'intrigue' (1668ff.) for intrico (in Florio, and in Hacket, 1670,) the word 'intricacy' (1602.) Of divertissant Evelyn in his "Diary" and in "Sylva" (1645 and 1664) was fond. Although 'levee'—"reception"—was in the language since 1672, Miss Robinson in writing to Mrs. Delany used the form lever, 1742. Cockalane appears to have been used during the Restoration for "an incoherent story" (1650, 1676 Ethredge "Man of Mode.") For vigilia (1728) we have 'vigil' (1747.) Utinam, "an earnest wish or fervent desire," though convenient, has been lost to us: 1643 Sir Thomas Browne and 1718 "Entertainer." So non-obstante (1646 and 1653) for 'notwithstanding' (1380ff.)* with a non-dstante to (1659—1710.) 'Panegyris' was misused by Crashaw in 1646 for 'panegyric' (1603;) horse de frise was but a partial translation of 'cheval de frise' (1688) in a military dictionary of 1702; and foiblesse (1685—1834) —'failing' (1382ff.)—and furole (1656—1867, dictionaries and word-books)—'corposant' (1881ff.)—are doubtfully obsolete.

The rareness of these terms cannot be too strongly stressed. But it is doubtful if English sounds had much to do with the disappearance of even cockalane and lever.

* Prep. 1380ff., adj. 1440 ff., conj. 1449ff.

The English language still possesses, of course, a great number of onomatopœic words; yet the stock here as elsewhere has a way of waxing and waning, and it will perhaps interest us to look at a few imitative and echoic words that have disappeared since, roughly, 1700 or 1750,—always, it should be added, with an eye to causes. There is no specific cause, one imagines, why a word like blutter should disappear. Such a word is apt, very apt (it may be,) to be called into existence at any time; and it is just as apt, in the midst of a multiplicity of like terms, to be isolated in writing or speech, and lost. Blutter is associated with 'blurt' and other 'bl-' words, thus, and perhaps also with 'utter,' 'mutter,' 'splutter.' 'Blatter' (1525) is particularly close. Baxter in 1630 wrote, "If the Minister should blutter any Errour or Undecency." Hickeringill advised in "Priestcraft" (1705:) "Let not thine Heart . . blutter any thing before God." This is all the New English Dictionary offers. Was the word used in speech? We have no way of knowing. It is not improbable that it was; the dates seem to indicate the possibility. It is not at all improbable that both Baxter and Hickeringill spoke the word, perhaps many times. A minister in his pulpit has very notably a way of doing such things. Blutter, 'bluster,' 'blabber' and the like were not strong enough for a critic like "Christopher North," the present author is told by a friend; Wilson in his writings was fond of 'blather.' In an altogether remote sort of way, 'blather' may be said to have superseded blutter because of its stronger sound-suggestiveness. But of course, in the nature of things, there was no real superseding.*

* Dates are interesting. 'Bluster:' 1494; 'blatter:' 1525, (sb.,

Quite a number of onomatopoeic or echoic words could probably be found in Rabelais; and Urquhart and Motteux have transmitted bruzz, cigling, snuttering, sussing, whick, and others. These occur nowhere else, and all help to describe the noises of animals: bruzz, the growling of a bear, cigling, chirping or chirring like that of the cicada, sussing, the 'spitting' of a cat ("Barking of Currs, . . . sussing of Kitnings,") whick, "to squeak, as a pig." Elsewhere, "The snarling of Messens, ranting of rats, . . . snuttering of Monks" are mentioned (Urquhart's translation.) N. Cox in 1677 wrote, "When you have tamed" your nightingales "they begin to Cur and Sweet with cheerfulness;" and he used the word sweet a second time. In the same year in another writing another author wrote, "The Goat did blare, squeak did the Hare, And there the Eagle frilled." Holme in 1688 described the eagle as frilling or "screaking." "While he glugglute their blood, as the young Haglets are said to do," wrote Trapp in 1650. Clayton in a number of the "Philosophical Transactions" (1693:) "A Duck has larger Nerves that come into their Bills than Geese or any other Bird that I have seen and therefore quafer and grope out their meat the most." Derham and another writer copied this as 'quaffer.' Holme in his "Armoury" (1638) said, "The Turkey Cock Jollopeth." Snatter (from the Dutch, 1647 and 1662) signifies the same as does another onomatopoeic word: 'chatter.' All of these words are of rarest occurrence. Barr, also in Urquhart's Rabelais, is doubtfully onomatopoeic. "To utter the peculiar cry of an elephant" is its meaning.

1787, Burns, Mrs. Carlyle, others;) 'blurt' 1573; 'sputter:' 1631 (in the appropriate sense; earliest date is 1593;) 'splutter:' 1729; bluther: 1697 only. 'Blather,' 'blether,' as a verb, possibly has some suggestion in the modern mind of 'lather' in it? It is an Old Norse word, "nonsense," and is not onomatopoeic.

Bary, of which it is a variant, is from Old French and is obsolete also and rare. (1594.) There is Latin 'barrus,' "elephant." Nyrop (App. A, p. 475) appears not to have mentioned the French word. Urquhart wrote: "The bawling of mastiffs . . . barring of elephants;" and in a note: "An elephant, which out of reverence for the pope his master would barr and bend the knee." But the word is utterly gone. Why? Circuses still come to town. The elephant, in both life and literature, has his share of renown. Still, we seem to need no word like barr to describe his cry. We speak of his "trumpeting."* But it is interesting to note that long before this word 'trumpeting' was thus used, a clever mind imaginatively heard the "barring of elephants."

It is not so difficult to see why Holme's jollopeth was in the vocabulary and probably straightway out of it—never gained vogue. His word is pleasantly amusing. And it was, relatively speaking, in the language for at least an instant. But 'gobble,' despite dates in the NED, was probably some time before it, and there simply was no rivalry. Let us suppose there was a rivalry. Is it too much to think that jollop had even then disappeared? Is jollop a somewhat more refined form, and 'gobble' (especially in its associations with the NED's "v.¹") more colloquial and facile sort of term? Conjectures do not help much; 'gobble' had the ascendancy from at least 1680, and gained vogue in the writings of Elia, Goldsmith, Irving, Kipling, and others. Southey in his "Doctor" used the nonce-imitation or variant 'gob-gobble;' and 'gobbling' (vbl. sb.) appears in the writings of another later author. Then there are 'gobbling,' 'gbbbler,' 'gobblery'

* Verb lb. First use in writing 1828 Capt. Mundy "My elephant suddenly raised his trunk and trumpeted . . ." 1860, 1872 (Darwin). Strange that mosquitoes also trumpet! (1900 . . .)

—perhaps others. Jollop in any event would have had a powerful rival in 'gobble.'

The truth would seem to be that we have little call for such words as are given above—onomatopoeic cries and calls of animals. When we do wish for such words, if we cannot be as inventive as Rabelais and his translators into English, or Randall Holme, or Southey, we supply what we can. We have words for ordinary purposes—words either like 'cuckoo' and 'mew' and even an expression like 'f-f-f-fff,' or like 'bark' (AS. 'beorcan') and 'screech' (which, though it comes to us from the Scandinavian, is probably echoic or onomatopoeic in origin. It is hard to get away, here, from remote onomatops.) And so the obsoletisms submitted above are rare in more than one sense. They are exceptional creations from exceptional minds.

Crashing lead sounds like cant, but is not. One sense was "tin, from its crackling when breaking," and the word or phrase was thus used in 1678. "The smiter . . . has a particular manner of falling and flabbing its wings," wrote an author on pigeons in 1765. Fruzt, Evelyn's word in 1693 ("De la Quint. Compl. Gardn") is interesting: "a collection of short and small branches." It was a handy word for his purpose. But of course in ordinary life the thing designated is now itself of rarest occurrence. Ralsh is another lone example—"a harsh swish," 1710 "Last Distemper of Tom Whigg." Sosh was introduced by a translator in 1687, "I fell with a sosh in the Valley below." Cox, quoted above, wrote, "There is no getting a shoot at them without a Stalking horse . . . who will . . . walk up and down in the Water which way you please, flodding and eating." Today we would say 'plodding'. Glash is doubtfully onomatopoeic but surely Scottish and obsolete, and was used in the eighteenth century, "to

come like a flash of light." Brome in a play written about 1652 made much use of the term thrip and 'Thripperstown' and 'thripping' — "spinning." Thrumble, apparently derived from 'thrum' (also echoic, 1592,) John Crowne in his "Sir Courtly" used thus: "No, Madam, he 's the General Gūtarre o' the Town;" Whereupon the lady replies, "Well, I have provided one shall thrumble on him." 'Twang' is still in our vocabulary. But Marvell's was a delicate kind of disposal or use of this word in his verse, "At myllines the fishes twang."

Onomatopoeic words like fix-fax, "the fix fax o' their din," Scottish, like flicket-a-flacket and rimble-ramble and trolloil come and go most currently. Not all reduplicative forms are echoic, to be sure; but they are often so much alike that any reasonable explanation of the disappearance of one is likely to be a reasonable explanation of all. The trouble is, accordingly, to find a reason for the obsolescence of bribble-brabble, from brabble, "vain clatter or wrangling," 1665, of fingle-fangle, from fangle, 1652--1710 (used by Brome, Butler, and in the "British Apollo,") flaunt-tant, formation on 'flaunt,' "a showy array of words," 1661 ("cf. flauntitantiing," fluster-buster, nonce and purely comic in "Monthly Mercury" for 1696, hedley medley, a riming jingle upon 'medley,' with cross reference to 'hugger-mugger,' 1646, hivie-skivy ("The bull is turned out of the alderman's house; and then hivie-skivy, tag and rag, men, women, and children . . with all the dogs in the town, promiscuously running ter him . . ") hurry-turry, -burry, Scottish, Mrs. Delany in 1732 and again in 1774 in her correspondence, scribble-scrabble, spank-span-new, and yet others? It is interesting to note that most of these are founded on simpler and earlier forms. Fluster-bluster is especially interesting. It occurred not only in the "Monthly Mercury" above,

but was used by Motteux in translating Rabelais: "Æolus and his Flusterbusters." 'Fluster' as a substantive, though in the language since 1676, is limited in use today—"flurry," 1728 ff. Both 'bluster' and 'blusterer' have been vigorously alive since 1583 and 1597, so that, with these three terms at hand, there was little call for still another term that should endure. Both Urquhart and Motteux, and many writers like them—of all times—, were anxious to enlist the services of such words, such intensives. These "served their purpose, which was all they asked of them."

Scribble-scrabble and spank span-new are two more such intensives. Farquhar in 1702 used the first; he put it into the mouth of a drunk man* in "The Twin Rivals"—"Uboo, here ish nothing but scribble scrabble Paper, I tink." The word is not wholly obsolete today. It may still designate "a scribble, hasty or careless writing." It was used as a verb in 1860. But for ordinary purposes the less emphatic 'scribble' (1577 ff.) does sufficient service. Spank span-new is intensive for 'span-new' (1300 ff.,) but was used only once, it seems, in writing: 1775. 'Hugger-mugger' has been in the language since the early sixteenth century (1529,) and this in part probably accounts for the unneededness of a form used in 1654, hugger-mug.

Blob-tale, in conclusion, is quite interesting. 'Telltale' (or 'tell-tale') was more than a century before it (a. 1545 ff.,) and likewise 'tattler' (1550 ff.; op. 'tellteller' 1473.) Yet Hacket, to intensify his expression, created blob-tale. 'Blob' (variant of 'blab,' 1374) is undeniably a stronger sort of word than 'tell.' No compound 'blab-tale' apparently exists. But 'tell-tale' has been

* See p. 56, footnote.

much used throughout the sixteenth to twentieth centuries, and is adequate in ordinary use. One feels that if both of these compounds, blob-tale and 'tell-tale,' were in the vocabulary, most people out of some sense of courtesy and decency would choose the latter. There is such a thing as becoming not too copious but too strong in one's epithets.

If, then, we seek precise reasons as to why such words become obsolete, precise reasons are seldom forthcoming. But if we get together a sufficiently impressive abundance of words, obsolete onomatopoeia, or the like, we perhaps wonder that more of them in the New English Dictionary are not marked "Obs." The vocabulary here is not alone copious, but colorful. And literature would not be itself (once more in the thought of Richard Grant White) except for original and forceful words like blutter, cheho and chowter, and sosh.*

"Words," writes Robert Bridges in his interesting study of Homophones (Bib. 434,) "fall out of use for other reasons than homophony, therefore one cannot in any one case assume that ambiguity of meaning was the active cause: indeed the mere familiarity of the sound might prolong a word's life; and homophones are themselves frequently made just in this way, for uneducated speakers will more readily adapt a familiar sound to a new meaning . . . than take the

* Interesting indeed are onomatopoeic words descriptive of the sounds people make: cheho, nonce, echoic, "to sneeze," used by E. Ward in 1706 "Hud. Rediv.;" chowter, "to grumble or mutter like a forward child" (Johnson; also in Phillips, Kersey, &c.); fuzz, "to buzz," 1676 T. Mace; gabber, cf. 'jabber,' "to talk volubly," 1706 Farquhar, 1808 Jamieson (Gloss.); glotter, ? echoic, "to chatter," 1656, 1688 Holme; glub, echoic, cf. 'glug,' 1794; granch, "to gnash (the teeth)," 1736, 1886; hatch, "to cough," 1733; twang, "blow the nose," 1748 Richardson "Clarissa" and 1810

trouble to observe and preserve the differentiation of a new sound" (pp. 24—25.) "There is," he concludes, "no rule except that any loss of distinction may be a first step towards total loss." He emphasizes the notion that there can be no direct proof here, but would "make much of the consideration whether the word had supplied a real need" (see notes in the bibliography.) He gives (pp. 26—29) brief lists of obsolete homophones in which the specimens (chiefly from Shakespeare) may have been lost to the vocabulary because, chiefly, of their homophony, and in which degree of obsolescence or obsolescence (carefully distinguished between) are, as Dr. Bridges himself remarks, apparent. The section which follows, "That the loss due to homophony threatens to impoverish the language," is briefer, general, and opinionative, if not a shade opinionated.

The first list or "Table"* contains 69 words—"homophones taken

S. Green in the "Reformist," "Percival felt for his handkerchief, twanged his nose;" wratling, "Imitative," a. 1661 Fuller "Worthies" "[They] have an harsh and wratling kind of Speech, uttering their words with much difficulty, and wharling in the throat, and cannot well pronounce the Letter R." 'Rattling' is here referred to (cross-reference.) These examples and excerpts again prove how easily forthcoming the onomatopoeic word often is, and how subject it ultimately is not to exact duplication in a similar situation, but replacement by something "better"—more urgently suggestive.

* Pp. 26—28. A few are:

ancient: replaced by ensign
bate: remit
beck: a bow of the head: preserved in 'becks and nods', mutual loss with beck: rivulet.
boot: to profit: Sh. puns on it, showing that its absurdity was recognized.
bourne: streamlet: preserved in sense of limit by the line of Sh. which perhaps destroyed it.
breeze: gadfly.

brook (verb).
ear: to plough.
fain and feign: prob. mutual loss due to undefined sense of fain. n.b. fane also obsolete.
foil: common verb, obsolete.
gout: a drop of liquor.
hoar: only kept in combination, hoar-frost, hoar hairs.
hose: lost, though hosier remains, but specialized in garden-hose, &c.
hue: not now used of colour.

from among the obsolete words in Cunliffe's 'A New Shakespearean Dictionary,' Blackie, 1910." At least a few given by Dr. Bridges are not today obsolete.* A few are, like 'ear,' "to plough," at most archaic, richly embedded in our greatest literature; others, like 'fain,' 'feign,' and 'fane' ('fane' somewhat excepted,) like 'hoar' and 'hose' and 'hue' and 'muse' and 'raze,' are alive. 'Ear' in the sense of "to plough" is truly archaic. It has been in use since 888.

marry!

mated: confused in mind (well lost).

mouse (verb): to bite and tear. [homophon?]

neat: ox.

pink: ornamental slashing of dress. [compare word used of hunter's clothing in 19th century and today.]

quean: a woman

raze (to the ground). The meaning being the very opposite of raise, the word raze is intolerable. [!]

speed: as in 'St. Francis by thy speed': help, aid.

tarre: to 'tarre a dog on': incite.

wreak.

* Dr. Bridges, as remarked above, is pleasingly careful about 'obsolete' and 'obsolescent.' He submits both kinds: the first (obsolete) from Shakespeare, the second (obsolescent) from our own age—"a few words that seem to be actually going out of use in the present day, that is, strictly obsolescent words caught in the act of flitting." Some of these obsolescent words are given below. Then the writer goes on to say: "Obsolescence in this connexion must be understood only of common educated speech, that is, the average speaker's vocabulary. Obsolescent words are old words which, when heard in talk, will sound literary or unusual; in literature they can seem at home, and will often give freshness without affectation; indeed, any word that has an honourable place in Shakespeare or the Bible can never quite die, and may perhaps some day recover its old vitality."

Obsolescence and obsolescence are not of course absolute concepts. But we are straightway in danger if we too much condition the meaning of either term—meanings and implications. For upon too much conditioning the signification of the term 'obsolescence,' say, we immediately lose any only possible "touchstone." There is no other word, no other concept, no other anything in English to use as a touchstone or standard. This is why, for one reason only, it is not artful to talk of "only . . . common educated speech" and "old words . . . heard in talk," &c. Obsolescent words are by no means always old (even relatively speaking,) and certainly do not always "sound literary or unusual"—which last word ('unusual') the reader will not deny, is vague in meaning here. But Dr. Bridges does below, it is true, speak of "grades" ("various grades") "of obsolescence."

The philologist will recall its remote connexion with 'arable'—remote in time. The Bible student or minister will recall 1 Corinthians ix. 10. The student of literature will find a use of 'ear' in this sense, "to plough," dated 1355 in the Oxford Dictionary. And its use all along suggests strongly its true character—the fact of archaism. And archaism, it must be insisted, is not obsolescence; it is scarcely even a special kind of obsolescence.*

It is strange that Dr. Bridges should make the statements he does about 'fain' and 'feign' and 'fane,' and 'hose,' 'hue,' and 'raze.' There are no "grades of obsolescence" here. 'Raze' may or may not seem "intolerable" to the reader; but it is still much in use, according to the New English Dictionary, and the present writer is very certain not of its use alone, but its indispensability in American newspaper usage. "The building was razed to the ground." It may so occur in a "fire" story, or it may be so used in an account of workmen tearing down a structure slowly, stone by stone. Perhaps Dr. Bridges had American newspapers in mind when he wrote "intolerable." But American journalists find the word indispensable because there is no other single short word so acutely expressive in the vocabulary. The present writer cannot speak thus for British English; but he submits what the Oxford Dictionary seems to give as fact—the aliveness of this word in our language today.

Even 'gout,' which should show some "grade of obsolescence," shows little if any according to the NED ("after Shakespeare, a large splash or clot," with dates: 1505--1867, and considerably used.)

* Vide pp. 110 ff., esp. p. 110 footnote and Appendix A, Miss Miller, p. 471. Archaic words are remotely like obsolete ones, but they are perennially in a class by themselves.

The Philologist will its remote connexion with 'arable.'

'Hose,' except in a sense which had some vogue for two centuries (1460 to 1650,) "breeches," has been firmly in the vocabulary since 1100. 'Hose,' "tube, pipe for water," is not a different word (1495 to present.) Of 'wont' the statement is made: "wont (sub.): lost in won't: will not." 'Wont' (sb.) is not lost. It is still in the language. And one doubts if it ever could be "lost in" the verbal contraction. Dr. Bridges' meaning is not always clear. "Arch," the adjective, is "probably obsolescent."

The section is concluded by a "Table of homophones that may seem to be presently falling out of use"—"words falling out of use or seldom heard now in the conversation of average educated persons who talk Southern English" "It is made from Jones' dictionary, which is therefore allowed to rule whether the word is obsolescent rather than obsolete" Ninety words are presented: 'ail,' 'alms,' 'ascent,' 'augur' (v.), 'barren,' 'bate,' 'bier,' 'bray,' 'bridal,' 'broach,' 'casque,' 'cede,' &c. It may be seriously questioned if as many as a dozen here are "in the act of flitting." 'Clime,' certainly, is a poetical word; and so are 'corse,' 'dene,' 'pale,' 'isle,' 'ween,' 'wight,' and 'wot'—and a few others. 'Rail,' "chide," is possibly growing obsolete (is possibly "obsolescent,") but not, it would be hard to imagine, because of its homophony with 'rail' the noun. 'Ore' is a specialized sort of word, and is indispensable in mining camps. When we need a word like 'rue,' we often need it very much; there is no word which adequately does its duty, plays its part. This is true of 'spray' in the florist's shop, at weddings, at funerals. 'Small-fry' in the fisherman's life, and also in figurative language, is about as important as 'other fishtto fry.' The American ducky is grandly fond of 'small-fry.' And so it might be possible to

take many more interesting homonyms presented by Dr. Bridges. But their obsolescence or obsolescence is contestable, more often than not, and those that are "fairly obsolete" by no means tend to show how, or even that, "homophones are self-destructive."

Miss Florence Miller in a thesis (unpublished) presented at an American University (Bib. 509 and Appendix A, pp. 461—472) cites both Dr. Bridges and Dr. Jespersen, who thinks that context will usually prevent misunderstanding ("Language," pp. 235—236.) Lounsbury likewise believes that, if used carefully, homophones will give us no trouble. ("Hostility to Certain Words," p. 367: Miss Miller's references.) She deals, in the course of her study, with some 150 obsolete or obsolescent or archaic homonyms,* but she concludes that

* On p. 263 she groups the obsolete homophones thus:

| | | | |
|------------|----------|------------|------------|
| mab | matte | minchen | mow |
| mackerel | matter | mint | mowe |
| mad | maugh | mire | mowel |
| madling | maund | miscreance | mower |
| maid | maur | mise | mowing |
| mail | max | miser | moyen |
| male (2) | may | mist (2) | moyse |
| man (2) | mayth | moal | muff |
| man-age | mazarine | mosion | mull |
| managery | meal | mole (2) | muller |
| mange | mean | molle | mullet (5) |
| manger | meaner | monger | mumps |
| mare | meanness | monstre | mungo (2) |
| marl | meddle | moose | munion |
| mart | medicine | mop (2) | murr |
| martel (2) | mele | mops | musclage |
| marter | melt | more (2) | muse (2) |
| martin | mene | morel | must |
| martlet | meon | mort | mute |
| mase | mere | moss | myll |
| mask | meri | mote (2) | myron |
| masker | mese | moul (2) | myxe |
| mason | mete | moulder | |
| mass | mewer | mound | |
| mast (3) | milan | mount | |
| mating | mile | mourning | |
| matrass | mill (3) | mover | |

the observation that other causes than homophony, or confusion from likeness in sound but difference in meaning, contribute to the obsolescence of about one-third of these words. "It is felt that the strongest evidence for the obsolescence of a word because of homophony is presented when both words are of the same part of speech . . . " She particularly notes the word 'maill' in Evelyn ("Diary" for May 8, 1641, "Recreating myself sometimes at the mail [mail], and sometimes about the towne,") the word 'mating' ('check-mating,' 'matching,' in Harvey,) and the word 'medicine' ("a medical practitioner" and "any substance or preparation," &c., Shakespeare.)

Miss Miller's examples suggest above all things two matters important to the study of homophones, and especially important here. The first is that we have little right to call that word a homophone which is scarcely used, or appears to have been never in use. Homophony, or confusion from likeness in sound but difference in meaning, as stated above, as a kind of destructive agent among words, must at least have been—or must be—manifest. The manifestation of this sound-phenomenon depends on a second thing: dates. How then can a word like monstre, "monstrance," used only c. 1480—1548, be a homophone of the same word in the nineteenth century, a foreignism from the French, and a favorite with journalists, 'monstre,' "demonstration"? How can melt as the obsolete synonym of 'magney' (1555) in 1598, and in the phrase (in Holme, 1698) "the melt of sheep" (also obsolete,) be the homonym of our nineteenth-century 'melt'? Likewise, from dates alone, it is difficult to see the homophony of mene, "intercourse, fellowship" (1200, 1250,) 'mean' (adj., 1374 ff.,) and 'mien' (only literary, "look, appearance," 1513 ff.,) or of meaner, obsolete as a substantive: "one of humble class." 1602, 1642 ("Lawyer,

Justice, Gentleman, or meaner do within the compasse of their places [etc.,]) "mediator," 1387—1450 ("Thow moder of all mercy, and the meaner,") and "one who means, intends," 1580—1712 ("Your double Meaners are despered up and down thro' all Parts of Town or City.") Mazarine is a better example of homophony, perhaps, and 'man' and man, "wickedness;"* but moose, "pottage, stewed vegetables," Turner twice in a work of 1563, is, dates aside (obs., 1563, lvg., 1613 ff.,) of the kind whose very use in the language may be questioned. Matte, trivial oath in "by the matte" (1553,) could hardly have been the homophone of the 'matte' of metallurgy in the early nineteenth century. Medicine, "medical practitioner," except for its rather close alliance with the other 'medicine' (1450--1632 and 1320 ff., respectively,) is again a better sort of example; and mackerel, "bawd, pimp" (1426--1700) and 'mackerel' the fish (1300 ff.) is similar. But it is difficult to think of madling in Mrs. Glasse's Cookery (1747) as a homophone of 'madling,' "mad creature," in the language since 1648. Mart as an obsolete alteration (1587--1726) of 'marque' and the other 'marts' ("marten" [700 ff.,] "market" [1437 ff.,] &c.) are more to the point.

One is again put in mind of Professor Wyld's statement, quoted some pages back (p. 54.) We can be sure of none of the above examples. The writer notes in his own lists words like allegator, "alleger" (1639 only and 1572 ff., respectively,) alligator, "one who binds or ties" (only a dictionary word, 1706, 1731,) and 'alligator' (the animal, 1563 ff.;) like bosh as verb (or 'bosh' the verb,) "to cut a dash, to flaunt,"

* Such a word, in a study of the OE--ME periods, would probably arrest its writer. Man ("wickedness") has long 'a.' There are other forms for 'man' ("they, people, one.") AGK p. 145 notes no word-study.

so used by Steele and Swift in "Tatler" No. 71 (1709; again elsewhere in 1726) and 'bosh!' like descide, verb, "to cut, indent" (1657 only--Tomlinson,) etch, "edge" (1691 Ray "Creation," "edging this way and that,") faithfullist, "a believer" (1653 Urquhart "Rabelais"--"like up-right Faithfullists, have firmly beleaved all to be true;" only use; homophony, of course, with 'faithfullest,') farry, verb, back-formation from 'farrier' taken as an agent-noun, and meaning (i. e., the verb farry) "farrier" (1807--1825 and 1814 ff., respectively,) farture and farsure, "stuffing" (1657 and earlier,) gracy (see p. 80,) granate (1706, "having many grains,") insect ("cut into," a. 1652,) ironist ("one who uses iron weapons," 1654,) last ("unit of measure of ship's burden," 1643--1796,) late ("broad, wide," 1657 only,) pearl (see below,) pediment ("a stake or prop for vines," 1727 Bradley; 'pediment' in architecture used since seventeenth century,) prescious (1643--1765, 'prescient,' 'precious,') promotor (1706 translation only; 'promoter,' 1450 ff.,) punk ("a punch," 1670 only; 'punk,' "prostitute," 1596 ff.,) reclaiMER, requiem, resemblance ("assembly,") retentive ("that reverberates or resounds," 1728 Pope,) rowing, scenary ("scenic," 1730--1758 and 1623 ff., respectively,) seiler ("one who 'cells,'" 1672, 1688,) stammerer, tindal, dart, violet ("violin" [1688, 1579 ff.,]) max, mote, munion, millenar, and many more, if one wishes to search. But here again probability of usage and dates, more often than not, interfere with any theory one may have of homophony from this viewpoint.*

Thus ironist above. Recently there seems to have been less and

* Homophony does not of course mean "confusion from likeness in sound but difference in meaning" (p. 152.) It is often meant to imply the confusion, however.

less use of this word—"one who uses irony," 1727 to 1836, "one who uses iron weapons," 1654 only. One is also put in mind of 'ironer.' The meanings and associations of 'iron' make a word like ironist at once difficult, both in writing and speech. Pearl is obsolete as a substantive meaning, or rather naming, a kind of fish, and a concoction for a canary. Color-association was perhaps responsible for the first, the fish otherwise called 'brill' (1481:) pearl in this meaning was used in 1672. In a 1682 publication "a good pearl with the whites of 8 eggs" is spoken of. Allegator and alligator ("alleger" and the animal) were evidently all pronounced the same—æ·lige¹ter—but the first word was used only once in writing. There is little use here in inquiring into the sound of 'l' in descide, since it too occurs but once in writing. Quite a number of words like 'camel' are in our language—words in which one meaning or association dominates, and hopelessly outshines homophones. Yet if 'camel' is no longer a denomination given to a kind of pit-coal (1753,) it is technically applied to a machine for giving buoyancy to vessels. Harp, thus, in the sense of "moor buzzard" (1671,) has been ultimately replaced by 'harpy' in this association. Interesting as it is in its various meanings and associations, high-boy, from the viewpoint of dates alone, is hardly (so to speak) its own homophone. In the late seventeenth century writings of L'Estrange, Brooks, and Mrs. Centlivre and others, it had (in designating certain species of males) social and political associations which are a little history in themselves. But in New England, not long ago, 'high-boys' and 'low-boys' were chests of drawers. The date for 'low boy' in the NED is 1899; 'high boy' seems not, in this sense, to be given (see therefore the "Century" of other dictionary, 1889 ff.) In egomism, 'egotism,' and

'egoism' (see p. 63,) we have much more danger of form-confusion, especially if we carefully allot meanings; yet here too, dates counting for so much, and use, homophony is hardly in evidence. Robert Bridges cites 'fain,' 'feign,' and 'fane' (poetical,) the obsolescence of all which is most doubtful; but fainlessly, "without attempted evasion," used in 1652 by Gaule ("Women . . have fainlessly and willingly left their bodies and embraced their deaths,") shows possibly a confusion of words--of spellings and sounds ('fain,' 'feign.')

Unquestionably words having the same sounds, but not the same meanings, as other words--homophones, that is--pass out of use. It would, in the opinion of the present writer, be most difficult to maintain that sound-likeness especially, and perhaps even form-likeness or near-form-likeness (to be discussed in the next chapter,) ~~area~~ cause working for obsolescence among words. The "obsolescence of homophones" in all that it implies is a very theoretical and unsatisfactory sort of phrase to use or conjure with if one is bent on answering what seems a simple question: Why do words become obsolete? Why do homophones become obsolete? In the first place, very few homophones do become obsolete in English. This needs no demonstration: or if truly it does, the lists supplied by Dr. Bridges (1775 homophones!) should surely be adequate. Secondly, a careful investigation of those homophones that are obsolete would probably show that they became obsolete because of other facts or causes than homophony. Dates, in such an investigation, would be of prime importance. So would knowledge of the actual use of words, homophones. So would knowledge of past or ancient pronunciations. Words in all their phases are deceitful.

Why (it might be asked) should a homophone become obsolete?

Because it is a homophone? But there must be some further reason. A thing to make one very testy indeed in such a study as this is the thought that there are often reasons "beyond," reasons within reasons. Dr. Bridges declares, "homophones are a nuisance." He offers, in a footnote (p. 19,) proof from the poets—Homer and Donne. Yet in his own prose on the same page, within the compass of 16 lines, he uses 16 homophones. He uses them because he must, and without ambiguity. One reads the passage aloud, and the homophones are not nuisances: 'box' ("a box on the ear,") 'may,' 'well' ("the origin as well as the decay,") 'raises,'* 'our,' 'slight,' 'cases,' 'not,' 'no,' 'one,' 'I,' 'but,' 'fit,' and 'two.'

The trouble is, of course, that some homophones are nuisances. They obviously "get in the way" and cause trouble in speech—spoken language. They still do: they are not obsolete. But their number is not great. The tests here are experience and memory. How often, among people speaking, do homophones make things go awry? Of how many unhappy or awkward experiences have homophones been the root of evil, within memory?

The subject is, nevertheless, an intriguing one. Above all things it invites the student's attention to be upon associations and meanings (early and late, and predominant or principal) and dates; it urges him to be aware of possibilities other than "homophony" itself; it demands that he keep his terminology, "homophony," "obso-

* Why, one might ask, with an eye to the list on p. 27, should raise be the intolerable word? 'Raise,' ON. in origin, is before 'raze' (Romanic, .: Fr., Sp., It. &c., 'rase,' 1400; in the sense with which we are concerned: 1547) in time. Dr. Bridges' only reason is: "The meaning being the very opposite," &c.

The present writer would call attention to Dr. Bridge's definition on p. 3 and to the appearance of 'mouse' (the verb) in the

lescence," "obsoleteness," in tact.

Can we, then, speak of the "obsolescence of English sounds"? As observed at the beginning of this chapter, words fall into disuse in various ways. It was the intention of this chapter to discuss, as far as the limits of this study allow, the disuse of words because of sounds in them; but it is to be acknowledged that "economy of effort," "absence of euphony," "ambiguity of homophones," and the like are not very helpful theories or phrases, and that few obsoletisms reveal much respective of sound. There are, to recapitulate, some 52,000 obsolete words in the English vocabulary; but many of these, a third, perhaps more, were never used, and others (especially if we have in mind "the language of men") are by the score "isolated" in literature; accordingly, there could not be many words falling into disuse because of some sound-peculiarity, or change in the phonetic pattern of words, since the seventeenth century. Words used in everyday conversation, in business circles, and the like, are usually indispensable.* Of course some are, from generation to generation, lost: names of obsolete articles, for example. But it is difficult to imagine the loss of a useful word because of some harshness or ambiguity in it when pronounced.

list on p. 27, "to bite andttear." Is the verb (not wholly obsolete) a homophone of the noun?—"When two or more words different in origin and signification are pronounced alike, whether they are alike or not in their spelling, they are said to be . . . homophones of each other." Attention should also be called to the quotation on p. 24, of Professor Jespersen, in view of his being cited above. . . . While he does not agree with all that Dr. Bridges says, the present writer wishes to express his admiration of this monograph by the late poet laureate.

* "The 'average vocabulary' &c.: see Ch. XI, p. 457.

Nevertheless English sounds do, in the course of time, change. And because of changes in sounds and the sounds of words, and the introduction of new sounds in new words, words do become obsolete. It is possible to speak of the disuse of certain English sounds.

Dr. Janet Rankin Aiken wrote, at Columbia University, a readable and helpful little book called "Why English Sounds Change" (1929.) Bib. 419.) She speaks particularly of the disuse of such a sound as the [x] sound in Scottish 'loch.' She shows, diagrammatically, how sounds have been simplified, tongue-action reduced, in 'folk' (OE. folc,) 'eight' (OE. eahta,) 'knee' (OE. cneo,) 'fee' (OE. feoh,) and the like. She chooses, carefully, the word 'accord' to describe why (and how) English sounds change: it designates, in her study, the unconscious tendency or process in which the "line" of sounds in a word is reduced, simplified. But it is unfair to appropriate—or divulge—the knowledge and ideas, presumably hard-earned, of another, thus.

The part that sound and sound-changes of all kinds would be found to play among words more anciently obsolete than those cited in this chapter, is a matter for conjecture.